DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 339 PS 009 198

AUTHOR Shipman, Virginia C.; And Others
TITLE Stability and Change in Family Status, Situational, and Process Variables and Their Relationship to Children's Cognitive Performance. Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences: ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Child Development Services Bureau (DHEW/OCD), Washington, D.C. Project Head Start.
REPORT NO ETS-PR-75-28
PUB DATE Sep 76
GRANT H-8256
NOTE 261p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$14.05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; *Cognitive Development; Demography; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Early Childhood Education; Family Characteristics; *Family Environment; Interviews; Locus of Control; *Longitudinal Studies; *Measurement Techniques; Mothers; Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; Social Development; Socioeconomic Influences; Sociometric Techniques
IDENTIFIERS *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This document is part of the ETS Head Start longitudinal study, Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences. The present study investigated the interrelationships among status, situational and process variables describing the child's home environment and the relationship of these variables to the child's concurrent cognitive-perceptual performance. Interview and test data collected when study children were 8 1/2 to 9 years of age were examined. The document is divided into chapters on sample characteristics, data collection and data analysis procedures, description of selected variables, study families in year six, stability and change in family characteristics, relationship of family characteristics to children's cognitive perceptual performance, summary and conclusions. Appendices include year six parent interview materials, and supplementary tables. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:
PS | UD

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED138339

PS 009198

PR-75-28

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND THEIR FIRST SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study

Stability and Change in Family Status, Situational, and Process Variables and Their Relationship to Children's Cognitive Performance

Virginia C. Shipman
J. David McKee
Brent Bridgeman

with

Melinda Boroson
Paul Butler-Nalin
Joyce Gant
Michaele Mikovsky

September 1976

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PR-75-28

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND THEIR FIRST SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study

Stability and Change in Family Status, Situational, and Process Variables and Their Relationship to Children's Cognitive Performance

Virginia C. Shipman, J. David McKee, and Brent Bridgeman

with

Melinda Boroson
Paul Butler-Nalin
Joyce Gant
Michaele Mikovsky

Report under

Grant Number H-8256

Prepared for: Project Head Start
Office of Child Development
U. S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare

September 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

Chapter

1. Introduction 1
2. Sample Characteristics 5
3. Data Collection Procedures 24
4. Description of Selected Variables 30
5. Data Analysis Procedures 45
6. Study Families in Year 6 50
7. Stability and Change in Family Characteristics 96
8. Relationship of Family Characteristics to Children's Cognitive-Perceptual Performance 127
9. Summary and Conclusions 162

References 180

Appendices

A. Year 6 Parent Interview
    1. General Interviewer Instructions
    2. Parent Interview

B. Supplementary Tables

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals contributed to the present report. The writers especially wish to express their appreciation to Melinda Boroson, Paul Butler-Nalin, Joyce Gant, and Michaele Mikovsky for their dedicated and valuable assistance in the many aspects of preparing this report. Special thanks also go to Walter Emmerich, Edmund Gordon, and William Ward for their constructive suggestions in reviewing the several drafts.

We are grateful to Joan Tyson and the women she supervised in coding these data and to Norma Hvasta and John Barone who performed the many and complex analyses reported.

Special thanks go also to Thelma Benton for the patience, speed and care with which she typed the several drafts.

We also wish to express our appreciation to the Office of Child Development, especially to Dr. Edith Grotberg, Director of Research and Evaluation, and to Dr. Maiso Bryant, Project Officer, for their support and counsel.

This study would not have been possible, however, without the sustained efforts, commitment, and skills of field personnel. We wish to express our gratitude to our site coordinators, Carolyn Tamblyn in Lee County, Alabama; Norma Hannam and Barbara Kern in Portland, Oregon; and Joyce Gant in Trenton, New Jersey; and to the local women who collected these data. For their patience and cooperation we also wish to thank the administrative and teaching staffs of the public and parochial schools where the testing described in this report took place.

Our deepest gratitude, however, goes to the children and their families who so willingly shared with us their attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs and provided us new insights into understanding the complexity of the young child's development.

Virginia C. Shipman
J. David McKee
Brent Bridgeman

Princeton, New Jersey
September 15, 1976

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The ETS-Head Start Longitudinal Study is addressed to two main questions: 1) What are the components of early education that are associated with the cognitive, personal, and social development of disadvantaged children? 2) What are the environmental and background variables that moderate these associations; more specifically, what are the processes underlying these influences?

The specific age range chosen for study was the developmental span of approximately 4 through 8 years of age--or from two years prior to entrance into the first grade through completion of third grade. This period is thought to be particularly important because it is a time during which many abilities consolidate and the child makes the social transition from familiar home surroundings to the world of school, peer, and unfamiliar adults. The first data were collected in the spring and summer of 1969 on over 1800 children, the majority falling between the ages of three years nine months (3-9) and four years eight months (4-8). All were scheduled to be enrolled in first grade in the fall of 1971. Data collection on these children and their families, communities, and schools continued through spring of 1974.

Earlier reports (Emmerich, 1971; 1973; Shipman, 1971; 1972b; Ward, 1973) described interrelationships among certain cognitive, perceptual, affective, and social behaviors of the children prior to their entry into grade school. For these analyses, mother's education, occupation of head of household, and income relative to household size were used as gross indexes of socioeconomic status. These indexes, however, inappropriately assume constancies of meaning within and across groups (cf. Light & Smith, 1971), and they tell us little about the type of stimulation the child is being exposed to in the home environment. Within a given SES level, the range of home environments can be so great as to make any generalization about SES level and development extremely tenuous (Pavenstedt, 1965; Tulkin, 1968; Zigler, 1968). To better understand the influence of sociocultural determinants, efforts have been directed toward more fine-grained analyses using indices from the parent interview and mother-child interaction session data gathered in the first year of the study.

An earlier report on the Year 1 parent interview (Shipman, 1972a) was a first step in that direction as it provided 1) a description of interrelationships among certain demographic indices, maternal attitudes, and behaviors reported in the parent interview, and 2) plans for obtaining a reduced set of scores suggested by the results of structural analyses. A subsequent report (Shipman, 1973) continued the description of the initial sample and delineation of family variables by presenting data from two structured mother-child teaching situations (Eight-Block Sorting Task and Etch-A-Sketch Interaction Task) administered during the first testing period. This report also provided a description of the interrelationships among these interaction behaviors with maternal attitudes and behaviors reported in the parent interview and their association with the child's concurrent performance on a variety of test measures. Also reported was the extent to which differential results were obtained by age, sex, later preschool attendance and social status of the child prior to any preschool experience. Recent analyses by Emmerich (1977) investigated the influence of specific maternal behaviors observed during the Eight-Block Sorting

Task interaction session on the child's subsequent personal-social behavior in preschool.

The present study continues the investigation of the interrelationships among status, situational, and process variables describing the child's home environment and the relationship of these variables to the child's concurrent cognitive-perceptual performance by examining interview and test data collected when study children were 8 1/2 to 9 years of age. Given the emphasis in current research on the role of home and school influences on children's academic performance, present analyses focused on performance in basic school skills of reading and math. For those families seen in both Years 1 and 6, the ensuing longitudinal data enabled assessment of the stability of sociocultural determinants and the extent of impact of early home influences on later school success, plus developmental trends and those interrelationships that become increasingly apparent with measurement in subsequent years.

As static group categories are thus replaced by delineation of those behavioral and attitudinal variables reflecting processes which link social and cultural environments to the emerging capabilities of young children, meaningful SES relationships may be determined. By isolating more exact demographic characteristics, we should be in a better position to explain why, within homes of similar socioeconomic status, so much variation in process is found, and why there are so many notable exceptions to the "low status--low achievement" maxim. We recognize, however, that socialization is a cumulative process (cf. Clausen 1968) and that the grade-school child is exposed to a multiplicity of diverse socialization agents whose influence may or may not be congruent or complementary. The current study, therefore, is but one step in a program of research that investigates the interactive effects of community, home, and school on the child's development.

Report Organization

The next chapter, Sample Characteristics, provides tables and statistics which indicate both the composition of the interview sample in Year 6 and a core longitudinal sample with scorable interview and child test data in both Years 1 and 6. Included also is a discussion of the extent to which this core sample differs both from the initial sample and from the total longitudinal sample. Chapter 3, Data Collection Procedures, presents a brief discussion of how the interview, interaction, and test data were gathered. In Chapter 4, Description of Selected Variables, a description of the major variables investigated is provided. Chapter 5, Data Analysis Procedures, describes the various processing operations and methods of analysis pertinent to this report. Chapter 6, Study Families in Year 6, presents the findings from the various descriptive and structural analyses of the Year 6 data for the total sample, including comparisons by major classifications (i.e., the child's sex, race, preschool attendance, and geographical location). Chapter 7, Stability and Change in Family Characteristics, provides a comparison of Year 6 findings with Year 1 findings for the longitudinal sample. Particular emphasis is placed on the relationship of the study child's attendance in Head Start to stability and change in both mean levels and patterns of correlations of family indices. Chapter 8, Relationship of Family Characteristics to Children's Cognitive-Perceptual Performance, presents relationships for both concurrent indices of the family environment and those obtained in Year 1. Chapter 9, Summary and Conclusions, summarizes the findings and discusses their implications for socioeducational intervention and future research strategies.

Chapter 2

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Sample selection procedures and initial sample characteristics for the Longitudinal Study are presented in Project Report 71-19 (Shipman, 1971). Briefly, in the fall of 1968 four regionally distinct communities were selected which (1) had sufficient numbers of children in grade school and in the Head Start program, (2) appeared feasible for longitudinal study given expressed community and school cooperation and expected mobility rates, and (3) offered variation in preschool and primary grade experiences. The study sites chosen were Lee County, Alabama; Portland, Oregon; St. Louis, Missouri; and Trenton, New Jersey. Within these communities, elementary school districts with a substantial proportion of the population eligible for Head Start were selected. In each school district an attempt was made to test all nonphysically-handicapped, English-speaking children who were expected to enroll in first grade in the fall of 1971 (i.e., children of approximately 3 1/2 to 4 1/2 years of age).

In 1969 mothers were interviewed and children tested prior to their enrollment in Head Start or any other preschool program. For this initial four-site sample at least partial data were obtained on a total of 1875 children, with Lee County and Portland constituting 60% of the sample. Sixty-two percent of the sample was black, with boys comprising 53% of the overall sample, 54.5% of the black sample, and 50.5% of the white sample. For the three sites in which children had the opportunity to attend Head Start in the second year of the study (1969-1970), 37.2% of the sample attended Head Start, 11% attended other preschool programs, and 51.8% had no known attendance in Head Start or other preschool programs. In Lee County, where Head Start was a kindergarten program, 41.7% of the initial sample attended Head Start, 19.1% attended other preschool programs, and 39.9% had no known attendance in Head Start or other preschool programs. While racial composition of the Head Start sample varied by site, substantially more blacks than whites attended Head Start; only 13.3% of the children enrolled were white. For a variety of reasons, the St. Louis site was dropped in the third year of the study and the 353 children there lost from further longitudinal study. By the end of the fourth year of the study in June 1972, the longitudinal sample consisted of 1086 children in three sites. In June of 1974, the six-year longitudinal sample contained 1017 children in three sites. Thus, except for the loss of St. Louis, attrition over six years was limited to about one-third of the original sample, with losses distributed equally across sexes and sites, but relatively greater for whites in each site. The six-year longitudinal sample went from 62% to 72% black across sites. Table 1 describes this six-year longitudinal sample (i.e., those children identified in 1969 and individually tested in spring 1974 in Lee County, Portland and

Table 1

Longitudinal Sample Characteristics: Year 6
Classified by Site

	Sex (%)			Race (%)			Preschool (%)		
	n	M	F	Black	White	Other	HS	PS	No Known
Lee County	416	56.2	43.8	59.5	40.3	0.2	54.9	16.7	28.4
Portland	347	52.7	47.3	74.3	23.3	2.3	49.0	37.8	13.3
Trenton	254	50.4	49.6	87.8	11.0	1.2	39.4	47.6	13.0
Total %	100	53.6	46.4	71.6	27.2	1.2	49.0	31.7	19.3
n	1017	545	472	728	277	12	498	322	197

Trenton. In addition, during the first five study years all children who moved into target schools and met the age requirements were added to the study sample and comprised shorter-term longitudinal samples.

Year 6 Interview Sample

In Year 6[1] only those children individually tested in a previous study year were individually tested and their mothers interviewed; group tests continued to be administered in classrooms with 50% or more study children. The mothers of 1212 study children were interviewed in Year 6. The majority (65%) of this sample of children (hereafter called the total sample for this report) were black and there were slightly more males (53%) than females. Fifty-two percent had attended Head Start and most of these were black (88%); about 55% of the children who attended Head Start were boys. Twenty-three percent (62% of them white) went to other preschools with boys still outnumbering girls (54%). The remaining quarter, who had not been enrolled in any preschool program, consisted of slightly more white (57%) and female (53%) children.

Table 2 describes this sample by sex, race, and preschool attendance categories for each site. Percentages are based on the total number of children within each site; other percentages (e.g., percent of the black sample attending Head Start) can be derived through addition and division of the appropriate cell frequencies. As can be seen, the sites were similar, but the following variations from the overall description should be noted. Lee County, the largest site with a total of 572 children, had a significantly larger

---

[1] Throughout the report "Year" refers to year of the Longitudinal Study.
Year 1 = January to August 1969 (child age 3 1/2-4 1/2);
Year 2 = September 1969 to August 1970 (child age 4 1/2-5 1/2);
Year 3 = September 1970 to August 1971 (child age 5 1/2-6 1/2);
Year 4 = September 1971 to August 1972 (child age 6 1/2-7 1/2);
Year 5 = September 1972 to August 1973 (child age 7 1/2-8 1/2);
Year 6 = September 1973 to August 1974 (child age 8 1/2-9 1/2).

Table 2

Description of Year 6 Parent Interview Sample
by Site, Race, Sex, and Preschool Attendance

		Head Start			Other Preschool			No Known			Total		
		Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
Lee County	Male	153(27)	17(03)	170(30)	11(02)	75(13)	86(15)	4(*)	48(08)	52(09)	168(29)	140(24)	308(54)
	Female	116(20)	12(02)	128(22)	7(01)	67(12)	74(13)	4(*)	58(10)	62(11)	127(22)	137(24)	264(46)
	Total	269(47)	29(05)	298(52)	18(03)	142(25)	160(28)	8(01)	106(19)	114(20)	295(52)	277(48)	572
Portland	Male	84(23)	19(05)	103(28)	35(09)	11(03)	46(12)	25(07)	18(05)	43(12)	144(39)	48(13)	192(52)
	Female	73(20)	21(06)	94(25)	19(05)	16(04)	35(09)	24(06)	27(07)	51(14)	116(31)	64(17)	180(48)
	Total	157(42)	49(11)	197(53)	54(15)	27(07)	81(22)	49(13)	45(12)	94(25)	260(70)	112(30)	372
Trenton	Male	71(26)	5(02)	76(28)	18(07)	1(*)	19(07)	35(13)	9(03)	44(16)	124(46)	15(06)	139(50)
	Female	62(23)	2(01)	64(24)	17(06)	3(01)	20(07)	35(13)	10(04)	45(17)	114(43)	15(06)	129(48)
	Total	133(50)	7(03)	140(52)	35(13)	4(01)	39(15)	70(26)	19(07)	89(33)	238(89)	30(11)	268
3-Site	Male	308(25)	41(03)	349(29)	64(05)	87(07)	151(12)	64(05)	75(06)	139(11)	436(36)	203(17)	639(53)
	Female	251(21)	35(03)	286(24)	43(04)	86(07)	129(11)	63(05)	95(08)	158(13)	357(29)	216(18)	573(47)
	Total	559(46)	76(06)	635(52)	107(09)	173(14)	280(23)	127(10)	170(14)	297(65)	793(65)	419(35)	1212

Note. Numbers in parenthesis are percentages based on the total sample for each site.

* = less than one percent.

percentage of white children (48% vs. 35% in the total three-site sample), and slightly more males (54% vs. 53%). Trenton's sample of 268, which was the smallest, was the most racially unbalanced (89% were black). It also had the smallest percentage of children who attended other preschools (15%) and consequently the largest percentage with no preschool experience (33%). Since Head Start was a predominantly black program for the children in this sample, variation in racial composition across sites is primarily reflected in the different distribution by race for those children who did or did not attend other preschool programs.

Longitudinal Interview Sample

Two smaller groups were derived from this total interview sample to comprise the longitudinal interview sample described in this report. The larger of the two groups (_n_ = 852) included those children who were administered the Raven Colored Progressive Matrices in Year 6 and whose mothers were interviewed in Year 1 and reinterviewed in Year 6. Children in target third-grade classrooms (i.e., with 50% or more children who had been previously tested) who were administered the Cooperative Primary Tests and whose mothers were interviewed in both Years 1 and 6 made up the second, smaller subsample (_n_ = 523); almost all these children also were given the Raven. A considerable number of longitudinal children, though located for individual testing, were excluded from this sample. Some were no longer in target classrooms and thus were not administered the group achievement tests. In addition to simply moving out of the district, the most frequent reasons for no longer being in a target classroom were failing or skipping a grade, enrollment in a private/parochial school, and, in Portland, exercising the option available there to be bused to a different elementary school. Others were excluded because a parent interview was missing in Year 1 and/or Year 6. The most frequent reasons for not obtaining an interview were difficulties in scheduling because of the mother's prolonged absence from the home, illness, and multiple jobs; given flexible scheduling and rescheduling, refusals were extremely rare.

The longitudinal sample can be briefly described as follows. (As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, despite the discrepant total numbers for the Raven and Cooperative Primary Test groups that comprise this sample, percentages across breakdowns were essentially the same.) The majority were black (71%); boys comprised 53% of the sample. Fifty-seven percent had enrolled in Head Start, 24% had attended other preschool programs, and the remaining 19% had no preschool attendance on record. The Head Start group was essentially black (92%) and contained more males (56%). More white than black children had been enrolled in other preschool programs (about 64%), with males again present to a somewhat greater degree. Children not known to have been enrolled in any preschool program were divided about equally by both sex and race. Thus in comparison with the total Year 6 interview sample, this longitudinal sample comprised more blacks, more children who had attended Head Start, and fewer who had not enrolled in any preschool program. Except for a few differences in Portland to be described later, within the individual sites it was again true that the characteristics for the Raven and Cooperative Primary subgroups were generally so close as to make any further comparison unnecessary. Descriptions of the sample in each of the three sites follow.

Lee County, Alabama. Lee County contributed the largest number of children to the longitudinal sample (53%). Fifty-eight percent of the children were black, and there were slightly greater numbers of boys than girls (55%). More than half of this group (56%) had been enrolled in Head Start. About

Table 3

Description of Longitudinal Sample for Raven
by Site, Race, Sex, and Preschool Attendance

		Head Start			Other Preschool			No Known			Total		
		Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
Lee County	Male	120(32)	8(02)	128(34)	10(03)	54(14)	64(17)	1(*)	22(06)	23(06)	131(35)	84(22)	215(57)
	Female	81(22)	6(02)	87(23)	7(02)	44(12)	51(14)	1(*)	21(06)	22(06)	89(24)	71(19)	160(43)
	Total	201(54)	14(04)	215(57)	17(05)	98(26)	115(31)	2(*)	43(11)	45(12)	220(59)	155(41)	375
Portland	Male	67(24)	11(04)	78(28)	28(10)	5(02)	33(12)	18(06)	16(06)	34(12)	113(41)	32(12)	145(52)
	Female	60(22)	11(04)	71(26)	16(06)	13(05)	29(10)	16(06)	17(06)	33(12)	92(33)	41(15)	133(48)
	Total	127(46)	22(08)	149(54)	44(16)	18(06)	62(22)	34(12)	33(12)	67(24)	205(74)	73(26)	278
Trenton	Male	52(26)	5(03)	57(29)	10(05)	0(-)	10(05)	26(13)	5(03)	31(16)	88(44)	10(05)	98(49)
	Female	55(28)	1(*)	56(28)	11(06)	2(01)	13(07)	26(13)	6(03)	32(16)	92(46)	9(05)	101(51)
	Total	107(54)	6(03)	113(57)	21(11)	2(01)	23(12)	52(26)	11(06)	63(32)	180(90)	19(10)	199
3-Site	Male	239(28)	24(03)	263(31)	48(06)	59(07)	107(13)	45(05)	43(05)	88(11)	332(39)	126(15)	458(54)
	Female	196(23)	18(02)	214(25)	34(04)	59(07)	93(11)	43(05)	44(05)	87(10)	273(32)	121(14)	394(46)
	Total	435(51)	42(05)	477(56)	82(10)	118(14)	200(23)	88(10)	87(10)	175(21)	605(71)	247(29)	852

Note. Numbers in parenthesis are percentages based on the total sample for each site.

* = less than one percent.

Table 4

Description of Longitudinal Sample with Cooperative Primary Tests by Site, Race, Sex, and Preschool Attendance

		Head Start			Other Preschool			No Known			Total		
		Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
	Male	83(30)	7(03)	90(33)	8(03)	40(14)	48(17)	1(*)	14(05)	15(05)	92(33)	61(22)	153(55)
Lee County	Female	62(22)	4(01)	66(24)	7(03)	33(12)	40(14)	0(-)	17(06)	17(06)	69(25)	54(20)	123(45)
	Total	145(53)	11(04)	156(56)	15(05)	73(26)	88(32)	1(*)	31(11)	32(12)	161(58)	115(42)	276
	Male	34(27)	6(05)	40(32)	13(10)	2(02)	15(12)	7(06)	2(02)	9(07)	54(43)	10(08)	64(51)
Portland	Female	33(26)	3(02)	36(29)	10(08)	4(03)	14(11)	6(05)	6(05)	12(10)	49(39)	13(10)	62(49)
	Total	67(53)	9(07)	76(60)	23(18)	6(05)	29(23)	13(11)	8(06)	21(17)	103(82)	23(18)	126
	Male	34(28)	2(02)	36(30)	4(03)	0(-)	4(03)	17(14)	3(02)	20(17)	55(45)	5(04)	60(50)
Trenton	Female	29(24)	1(*)	30(25)	4(03)	2(02)	6(05)	20(17)	5(04)	25(21)	53(44)	8(07)	61(50)
	Total	63(52)	3(02)	66(55)	8(07)	2(02)	10(08)	37(30)	8(07)	45(37)	108(89)	13(11)	121
	Male	151(29)	15(03)	166(32)	25(05)	42(08)	67(13)	25(05)	19(04)	44(08)	201(38)	76(15)	277(53)
3-Site	Female	124(24)	8(02)	132(25)	21(04)	39(07)	60(11)	26(05)	28(05)	54(10)	171(33)	75(14)	246(27)
	Total	275(53)	23(04)	298(57)	46(09)	81(15)	127(24)	51(10)	47(09)	98(19)	372(71)	151(29)	523

Note. Numbers in parenthesis are percentages based on the total sample for each site.

* = Less than one percent.

one-third (32%) went to other preschool programs, and a fraction (12%) had no known preschool attendance. Lee County was unique among the three sites in that those children attending other preschool programs and those with no known preschool attendance were almost all white.

Portland, Oregon. Portland was the second largest site, with 82%[2] of the sample black and an equal proportion of boys and girls. Sixty percent[2] of the children had attended Head Start, about one-fourth (mostly black children) went to other preschool programs, and the remaining 17% had not attended preschool.

Trenton, New Jersey. Trenton had the smallest number of children within the sample (121); 89% of these were black. Similar to the other sites, more than half (55%) had attended Head Start. Only a small percentage (8-10%) had been enrolled in other preschools and a third (32-37%), most of whom were black, had not attended preschool. This was the highest percentage with no preschool among the three sites. The ratio of boys to girls was almost equal.

Thus, for this longitudinal sample the individual sites were again highly similar, with the few exceptions noted earlier for the total interview sample. Although the total sample was predominantly black (71%), the racial distribution in Lee County more closely approached equal proportions. Also, a slightly higher percentage of boys was present in Lee County. All three Head Start programs were almost exclusively black. However, in the overall sample, the black-white ratio was almost equal for children with no known preschool attendance, but in the individual sites this was not the case. As was mentioned above, this group in Lee County was predominantly white, in Trenton, almost entirely black, and in Portland was the most nearly racially balanced. Lee County also had a considerably higher proportion of white children in other preschool programs. In Trenton and Portland children who had enrolled in other preschool programs were mostly black. This confounding of site, race, and preschool attendance categories must be noted when interpreting any findings presented.

---

[2] Except that for the longitudinal Portland sample defined by child Raven scores, the percentage of black children was significantly less (74% vs. 82%). Similarly, for this sample a smaller percentage (54% vs. 60%) had attended Head Start, and more (24% vs. 17%) had not attended preschool.

The sex and race composition of this longitudinal interview sample is similar to that of the total six-year longitudinal sample. Lee County accounts for a larger proportion of the current sample (53% vs. 40%) while Portland accounts for a lesser proportion (24% vs. 34%). In the current sample the percentage of children who had attended Head Start was somewhat larger (57% vs. 49%) and those who had attended some other preschool program smaller (24% vs. 32%). Both Head Start groups were almost exclusively black, with more males than females. Children who had attended other preschools comprised groups that were two-thirds white, with a few percent more boys. In both samples those groups who had not attended preschool were almost equal by race and had about 10% more females present.

Attrition

The extent and nature of attrition that occurs in a longitudinal study must be examined carefully for these can have substantial implications for the findings obtained. As was described in the preceding paragraphs, in the present study the longitudinal sample changed not only in size but in relative proportions among certain major areas of classification (i.e., race, socioeconomic status, and preschool attendance category); a higher percentage of the remaining children came from black low-SES families and had attended Head Start. The causes of attrition were several. The greatest loss was due to those families (mostly white) who had moved out of the site; other families, often with multiple address and/or name changes, could not be tracked using existing school, job, or other project information. In some cases it was only the child who had moved out of the site to live with another guardian; in a few tragic situations the study child had died during the intervening years. In addition, parent interviews were not obtained for some families whose child was tested in Year 6 because the mother was unavailable during the data collection period due to extended illness or other prolonged family emergency or to a work schedule that made it too difficult (e.g., holding both day and night or regular and weekend jobs). Actual refusals were rare, although many appointments had to be rescheduled and many were completed following extensive tracking and juggling of interviewer schedules.

The additional attrition indicated for the subsamples described in this report arose from pecularities associated with particular measures. Earlier in the study it had been agreed that academic achievement measures would be administered according to local school guidelines. Since this required group administration by the teacher, it was decided following discussions with the local school administration that only those classrooms having 50% or more study children (i.e., those who had been tested at least once prior to Year 6) would receive these measures. The various reasons whereby a child would not be in a target classroom, although remaining in the study for all non-target classroom measures such as individual testing, parent interviews, school records, have been noted already (e.g., moving out of a target school district, attending a private school or, although attending a target school, absent during the testing period or enrolled in a non-target classroom since s/he had been retained, advanced a grade, or placed in a special class). Thus the majority of classroom measures were collected only in the original target school attendance districts while individual family and child measures were gathered throughout the site.

To better assess the extent of change from the initial sample both for the longitudinal sample and those subsamples included in the present report, _t_ tests were performed comparing the 94 scores available from the Year 1 interview for those families who in Year 6: 1) did or did not have a child who was tested; 2) were and were not reinterviewed; and 3) were reinterviewed, their child individually tested, and for whose child achievement test data were and were not obtained. To facilitate interpretation, analyses were performed both for the total sample and separately by race within site. Since the St. Louis site was dropped from the study in Year 3, analyses were performed on data from the three sites remaining in the study. The results are described below, with differences noted, unless specified otherwise, when $p \leq .01$.

When comparing the Year 1 interview responses of those families whose child was and was not tested individually with the Raven in Year 6 (n = 955 vs. 505), those significant differences obtained reflected the higher percentage of black and, given the confounding of SES and race in the present sample, low-income families previously reported for the longitudinal sample. That is, in the non-longitudinal sample parental education and occupational levels were higher, family size smaller although the number of single-parent families was fewer, number of household conveniences and the child's personal possessions greater, interviewer ratings of the physical appearance of the home were more favorable, and the ratio of rooms to people in the household greater. For those families for whom income information was obtained in Year 2, fewer non-longitudinal families met the OEO Head Start-eligibility criteria. More community facilities also were reported available. In addition, those Year 1 families who no longer were in the study sample had moved more prior to Year 1 and a greater proportion of them had expressed the desire to move again. Also, on the average, parents were younger, fewer had relatives living with them or nearby, and the mother was less knowledgeable about community resources. Congruent with their higher socioeconomic status non-longitudinal families in general reportedly went out more for entertainment, expected their child to be able to perform various skills and responsibilities at a younger age, predicted s/he would have less difficulty adjusting to school, read more to her/him, and expressed higher expectations for the child's educational achievement. Although fewer children of non-longitudinal families were identified as having had some preschool experience (Head Start or other) this primarily reflects a difference in availability of follow-up information rather than in preschool preference since most of these families were lost to the study during the period when their child might have attended preschool.

Results from the separate race within site analyses helped clarify the findings. It first must be noted that the difference in attrition for white and black study families was dramatic. As can be seen in Table 5, the percentage of white families who were interviewed in Year 1 and whose child was tested in Year 6 in Lee County, Portland, and Trenton was 52.9, 43.9, and 30.4, respectively. The comparative percentages for black families were 85.9, 73.1, and 74.0. Thus among black study families (who comprised the majority of the sample) there was little attrition and essentially no significant difference was found between groups. Within any site no more than three of the 94 items showed a difference significant at the .05 probability level. The most difference was observed in Trenton with non-longitudinal black families on the average slightly smaller and less positive in their attitudes

Table 5

Comparison of Longitudinal[a] and Non-longitudinal[a] Children by Race and Site

	Year 1 Interview Only	Year 1 Interview and Year 6 Raven	
	n	n	% Longitudinal
	Lee County		
Black	38	231	85.9
White	145	163	52.9
Total	183	394	68.3
	Portland		
Black	93	253	73.1
White	97	76	43.9
Total	190	329	63.4
	Trenton		
Black	73	208	74.0
White	55	24	30.4
Total	128	232	64.4

[a] Longitudinal = Year 1 Interview and Year 6 Raven available.
Non-longitudinal = Year 1 Interview but no Year 6 Raven available.

toward the local schools. As noted, attrition was considerably higher among white study families and a few significant differences were obtained between those white families who did and did not remain in the study. Most differences were found in Lee County which comprised the largest number of white study families. Response differences appeared to be associated with whether a parent was a student or junior staff member at Auburn University or was with the armed services at one of the nearby Georgia military camps; that is, in general, in non-longitudinal white families parents were younger, they were relatively new to the area and fewer had relatives nearby, they had moved more in the preceding three years and a higher percentage intended to move again soon, and more fathers were enrolled in further educational/vocational training. In Trenton, where during this six-year period the percentage of white families had decreased and the economic situation had deteriorated most, those white families who moved out of the city on the average initially had expressed higher educational aspirations for the study child and reported more personal possessions for her/him, although they used a narrower range of categories in describing teachers. With the exception of Portland non-longitudinal white mothers who reported using more severe verbal punishment when the study child did something that displeased them, there were no other significant differences within sites in the nature or extent of the mother's reported interaction with the study child, in her attitudes concerning the child, or in other maternal attitudes and behaviors assessed.

As would be expected since it included 841 of the 955 families, that subsample of the longitudinal sample who also were reinterviewed in Year 6 showed essentially the same differences. The much smaller subsample ($\underline{n}$ = 518) for whom child achievement test data also were available showed considerably fewer differences from the non-longitudinal sample.

Comparing families in the longitudinal sample who were excluded from particular analyses, it was found that those families whose child was not in a target classroom, and consequently was not administered the achievement tests, tended in Year 1 to have moved more in the preceding three years and not to have sent the study child to Head Start or any other preschool program. The separate site analyses again revealed few differences within race subgroups. Among white families, the few significant differences obtained suggested that in Portland those families whose child did not attend a target class in Year 1 had belonged to fewer groups, were less familiar with where to vote, and expressed a greater desire to move. Also, they had not enrolled their child in a preschool program and expected their child to perform various tasks at an older age. Perhaps reflecting the attitudes of those mothers who had not moved out of the target school district but who had chosen the option in Portland to bus their child to a school outside the district, in Year 1 more mothers in this group said that parental control would improve the local schools. Among the larger sample of black longitudinal families, there also were few significant differences. In Trenton, black mothers whose child no longer was in a target classroom in Year 1 reported reading more newspapers, and were more familiar with their child's favorite story; the fathers also tended to be younger. In contrast, in Lee County black families in this group were larger, lived in more impoverished conditions, and the study child accompanied the mother less on various excursions. Also, the mothers' mean educational level was lower and their expectations for the child's educational attainment less. In Portland, where there was a more even split in number of families (101 vs. 104), the only observed difference was in number of groups the mother belonged to in Year 1, with those whose child attended non-target classrooms having participated less. These findings may reflect site differences in the reasons for a child not being in a target classroom (i.e., moving out of a target school district, failing or skipping a grade, and enrolling the child in a non-target school).

Among families whose child was tested in Year 6, the only significant difference in Year 1 interview responses for families who were not reinterviewed in Year 6 ($\underline{n}$ = 114 vs. 841) was that the mother had belonged to fewer groups.

However, they also tended ($p < .02$) to have moved more and the father had held a lower status job. Given the small number of families who were not reinterviewed, the number available for separate race within site analyses was too small to enable reliable within-site comparisons. For example, the few significant differences obtained pertained to 12 white families in Lee County (vs. 151) who were not reinterviewed.

In summary, a detailed examination of attrition experienced in the samples included in the analyses described in the present study revealed a generally high percentage of families who were followed over the six-year period. As was evidenced in the separate race within site analyses, attrition primarily occurred for those white families temporarily residing in Lee County while connected with Auburn University or one of the nearby military bases. There were few if any differences obtained when Year 1 interview responses were compared for longitudinal families who were not reinterviewed in Year 6 or whose child was not administered a reading or math achievement test in a target classroom. The few differences that did emerge, however, pointed out the importance for adequate understanding of examining such attrition within its environmental context.

The relatively small attrition in the three remaining study sites is in large part due to the extraordinary tracking efforts of project field staff. The value of committed, knowledgeable local coordinators who have remained with the study and maintained warm trusting relationships with school personnel and community residents is inestimable. Given the frequent gaps in school records and the delays in transferring records when children move, effects compounded when the rate of school transfers is high, as it is in many urban areas, such smooth working relationships become especially critical. One of the primary needs for an effective longitudinal study is a core of longitudinal staff deeply committed to the study for whom each participant becomes a personal responsibility.

Implications

Before concluding this chapter it is important to remind the reader of the disproportionalities in the various classifications of importance. There are more blacks than whites, more boys than girls, more children who attended preschool programs, and various interactional differences, such as different proportions of blacks and whites who attended Head Start. The various demographic imbalances and disproportionalities in sample characteristics are a necessary consequence of the participant selection procedure initially employed in the study and of our nonintervention in the preschool educational decisions made by the parents of our study children. Moreover, any attempt to create a more balanced sample would have rendered the sample less representative of the preschool attendance groups actually existing in the study communities. These disproportionalities, however, complicate the interpretation of general means. Consequently, there is a need for caution in the interpretation of analyses since any factors associated with demographic characteristics are disproportionately represented.

Examination of the nature and extent of attrition in the samples included in the present study also suggest certain cautions in interpreting the findings. For example, in assessing stability and change in family status, situational, and process variables over the six-year period and the relationship of the child's early home environment to his/her cognitive performance at age 8 1/2 to 9, the sample will be predominantly black and economically disadvantaged. Given, however, the observed general lack of significant difference in the early home environment of those black families who no longer were in the study or who had missing data which excluded them from certain analyses, there are no apparent selective biases operating which should make the findings less generalizable to the original population of black families sampled. Also, the few differences that did emerge, although statistically significant were of relatively small magnitude, and thus unlikely to affect significantly any patterns of relationship found. Thus, contrary to the usual expectancies regarding longitudinal studies, the sample did not become skewed to those who live in more advantaged circumstances and/or are more favorable in their attitudes toward social institutions or compliant in their behavior. Throughout the discussion of results, however, an attempt will be made to remind the reader whenever attrition peculiar to a site would appear relevant to interpretation of the findings.

Chapter 3

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Year 1 Procedures

Community support and participation were essential if meaningful, useful data were to be obtained. Community leaders and administrators were consulted, and written intents (not merely consents) to participate in the study were sent to ETS by both community agencies and local school boards. Field operations were organized around local staff who served as coordinators, interviewers, testers, and observers. For the first phase of data collection, household canvassing and parent interviews, ETS subcontracted with the New York City firm of Audits and Surveys (A&S) to locate eligible children and then complete a 90-minute ETS-prepared interview with each eligible child's mother or mother surrogate. The interviewers, all female and matched by race with respondents, were recruited from the local communities, with A&S staff responsible for both training and supervision. In subsequent years of the study, parent interviews were handled in a similar manner, except that ETS assumed the training and supervision responsibilities that had been subcontracted to A&S.

During the first study year individual child tests and mother-child interaction tasks were administered by local women, most of whom were black housewives with limited work experience. While the usual educational credentials were not required, experience in working with young children was considered highly desirable, as was the ability to read well and speak with ease. After four to five weeks of training, final selection of testers was made by the project director and a senior member of the research team. Testing was monitored by the local coordinator and by ETS regional and Princeton office staffs.

Year 6 Procedures

Training procedures were essentially identical in later years except that with increased experience the training period could be reduced to three weeks. Differences between Year 1 and Year 6 data collection procedures primarily reflected the change in status of study children from age 3 1/2 to age 8 1/2. In the early years of the study, test centers were located in churches or community recreation facilities, while in later years testing was done in rooms available in the individual schools or in mobile vans parked outside of the school. The study was very fortunate to be able to continue to work with the same local coordinators whose commitment, loyalty and skill cannot be overemphasized. The continuity of the warm and smooth functioning relationships that they had established with school personnel in the various sites contributed significantly to the success of the study.

Budget reductions for Year 6 necessitated some cutbacks in data collection, however. Cuts were made primarily in one site rather than sharing them across sites. This was done to maintain the unique aspect of the study, namely the breadth and depth of measurement obtained over an important developmental period, so that the multivariate questions originally posed could still be addressed. As in Year 4 when a similarly difficult decision had to be made, the largest data collection efforts were focused on Lee County, Alabama and Portland, Oregon. Given a smaller longitudinal sample and the fact that budget constraints required a similar cutback in Year 4 (first grade) individual testing, Trenton seemed the most likely candidate for reduced data collection. Thus, interviews in Trenton were limited to families previously seen in Years 1 or 2. Measures relevant to the present report are parent interviews and individual- and group-administered child tests; a description of specific procedures for these tasks follow.

Training of Interviewers and Testers. As in Year 1, all training sessions in Year 6 were conducted by Princeton staff and comprised the following sequence: instruction on general testing procedures, specific task demonstrations, practice with trainers and other trainees, practice with children and adults of their acquaintance, and practice with unfamiliar children and adults similar to those in the study. All final evaluations were made during the last week by the principal investigator, following which additional practice and instruction on general management procedures was provided. For Trenton, training sessions took place at the ETS Princeton offices; for Lee County and Portland, in rented vacant classroom space and at the local coordinator's office. As in Years 2 through 4, the training period for testers was reduced to three weeks; training of interviewers usually comprised eight days. Training of parent interviewers and of child testers proceeded simultaneously at each site on a staggered start date.

Parent Interview. The Year 6 Parent Interview was approximately 1 1/2 hours in length and took place with the mother or maternal surrogate; a small honorarium was provided. A copy of the interview and general interview instructions may be found in Appendix A. As will be seen, items were organized in five parts--those referring specifically to the child, to his/her school experiences, to neighborhood schools and education in general, to the community, and to personal and family information. The order of items is deliberate since it has been found that most mothers are willing to talk about their children, and, as rapport is established during the process of the interview, become less unwilling to discuss more personal information, such as age, employment, etc. Ninety-three percent to 95% of the respondents were rated as cooperative or very cooperative on the five parts of the interview. At least three appointments were made (on different days and at different times) before considering the respondent a refusal. As in Year 1, all Year 6 interviews were conducted in the child's home; it was felt that a description of the child's physical surroundings at this time would provide valuable supplemental information. Also, as in Year 1, interviews were administered by local women and monitored by the site coordinators. Princeton staff checked all interviews received for missing or ambiguous information requiring followup and provided feedback to the local coordinators.

Data collection, however, is rarely the smooth operation outlined in a journal article. As anyone familiar with home interviewing will understand, conditions varied from a relaxed two-person chat on the living room sofa, to sitting at the kitchen table experiencing several interruptions from neighbors and children, to standing in a crowded one-room apartment. Thus, though the interview was administered on the average in 80 minutes, interview time ranged from 55 minutes to two hours. For 8% of the interviews, the noise level was high enough to be rated distracting. Also, recruiting interviewers proved to be difficult. Due to the critical gas shortage that developed that winter many were reluctant to assume a job which could involve considerable traveling. Once trained, several interviewers had unexpected serious illnesses requiring hospitalization and extended convalescence, and new staff had to be trained. Difficulties were encountered in scheduling interviews, too. Locating and contacting mothers for interviews often was a complicated matter involving tracking several changes of address. Given also the increased number of working mothers in the study, limiting their availability for interviews to evenings and weekends, interviewing proceeded very slowly and had to be extended past the school year. Consequently, some interviewers had to reduce their time working away from home, thereby further prolonging completion of this phase of data collection. The data thus reflect to an unknown extent any variation in response due to the time of year obtained and the interval between home and child assessment.

Individual testing. An attempt was made to locate and test all study children who had been individually tested in at least one previous year. The cooperation of local public and parochial school administrative and teaching staffs in assisting in the tracking of study children and facilitating data-gathering activities was a primary factor in the relatively low attrition in the study sample. Individual tests were grouped into two 1 3/4-hour batteries, with each battery usually administered in a single session with a child. Each battery included measures representing the range of areas being assessed; the order of tests within batteries reflected consideration for the need to balance types of responses (active vs. passive, verbal vs. nonverbal), and to stimulate and sustain the child's interest. In Lee County and Portland testers were trained to administer one of the two batteries; given the changes in measurement strategies in Trenton, several testers were trained on both batteries to allow for greater flexibility in scheduling. Testing, which proceeded from February through May, was monitored by the local coordinator. As noted earlier, all testing was done in the child's school or in a van parked in the school yard. Data were shipped weekly to the Princeton office where they were checked by tester trainers who provided feedback and monitoring of testing procedures.

Group testing. Group achievement tests were administered in the spring by the classroom teacher in target classrooms (those with 50% or more children who had been previously tested). The local coordinator explained the procedures for group testing and was available to assist the teacher as necessary.

Data Processing

The data from all the above measures were coded at the item level by ETS Princeton office staff and all coding was double-checked. When necessary, data were first scored, interscorer reliabilities obtained, and all scoring double-checked and discrepancies resolved by senior staff. The coded data were keypunched and independently verified, after which the resultant individual data tapes were edited for appropriate ID listing and for out-of-range values and scores logically inconsistent with other responses. To facilitate analysis, merge tapes for each study year were prepared which comprised all derived family and child scores from the separate task tapes.

For more detailed description of data collection and processing procedures see Project Report 72-18 (Shipman, 1972b).

Chapter 4

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED VARIABLES

Family Variables

Previous research (Caldwell, 1970; Hess, Shipman, Brophy & Bear, 1968, 1969; Pavenstadt, 1965; Tulkin, 1968; Wright & Wright, 1976; Zigler, 1968) and initial Longitudinal Study findings (Shipman, 1972a, 1973) suggest that children's home environments differ in measurable ways across and within SES. In order to examine different family "styles," including patterns of rearing children, pertinent characteristics of families have been classified into _process_ and _status_ variables. Such a distinction has been shown (e.g., Dave, 1963; Hess et al., 1968, 1969; Schaefer, 1972; Wolf, 1964) to be important in the study of the influence of the family environment on the child's development. Process variables concern various attitudes and dispositions of the family such as members' feelings of control over their lives and environment as well as various patterns of interactions between family members. Status variables reflect standard demographic descriptions of families such as parental occupational and educational level and offer little information about the nature of the family's attitudes and behaviors or their influence on the child's development. Situational variables may be viewed as similar to status variables in that they expand the description of the environment in which family behaviors are embedded; they tell us little, however, about participants' reactions to such situations.

Initial Longitudinal Study findings indicate that common socioeconomic indices are gross proxies for assessing the child's environment. Their use inappropriately assumes constancies of meaning within and across groups (cf. Light & Smith, 1971), and they tell us little about the nature and amount of stimulation the child receives in the home environment. As static group categories are replaced by those behavioral and attitudinal variables that reflect processes which link social and cultural environments to the development of young children, meaningful SES relationships may be determined. Previous findings also indicate that it is what the family does (process) rather than what it is (status) that has the greater impact on a child's development. Process variables certainly have greater theoretical utility for explaining how the environment mediates experience in critical ways. It is assumed that the mother is particularly influential in transmitting to the young child behaviors and adaptations shaped by the environment.[3] For these reasons, then, greater priority has been given in the study to process variables, particularly those related to the mother's perceptions and styles of interaction. Information about status and situational characteristics has been obtained only insofar as these either (a) define important aspects of the child's psychological as well as phusical environment, or (b) identify subpopulations which should be analyzed separately.

To study these various family influences, during the first study year we administered both a home interview (approximately 90 minutes) and three structured mother-child situations (Hess and Shipman Toy Sorting, Eight-Block Sorting, and Etch-A-Sketch Interaction Tasks) in which the mother is taught a relatively simple task and she, in turn, teaches it to her child. (The reader is referred to Project Report 73-35 (Shipman, 1973) for detailed descriptions of these tasks.)

---

[3] We recognize, however, the dearth of research concerning the father's influence on the development of the child in the early years--a paucity resulting primarily from practical problems of doing such research. Still in the majority of families, the mother or mother surrogate is the one most available to the child, and research has indicated the relatively less frequent and uninvolved interaction of the father with the young child (Freeberg & Payne, 1967). This is particularly true of the black low-income family, in which there is a relatively much higher incidence of father absence reported (Census, 1974). We also recognize that in intact homes the mother's behavior in relation to her child is likely to reflect, in varying degrees, procedures worked out jointly by the parents as well as being in part a product of her own adaptation to her husband's needs and her relationship with him. Similarly, interactions among other family members influence the mother's attitudes, beliefs, and actions.

The variables selected to examine maternal communication in the structured mother-child sessions reflected both information-processing and affective aspects of the interaction. Attention was focused on those variables involving transmission of task-specific information, use of feedback, affective responses, and techniques used to control the child or elicit his cooperation. The Etch-A-Sketch Interaction Task in which the mother and child together copied three geometric designs was designed to emphasize the affective and control aspects of mother-child interaction, thus complementing the other sorting tasks which placed a premium on information transmission. The accuracy of each attempt, number of attempts made, mother's predicted score (categorized according to percent of score possible), and her showing the model to be copied to the child were tabulated on each of the designs.

Prior to the interaction tasks, the mother was asked to imagine that her child was about to enter grade school and to relate what she would tell him/her and how she would prepare him/her for this new experience. This First Day of School Question was included in the study as a projective-type technique to assess the mother's estimation of the relevant areas of school situations, thus providing an index of her socialization of the child into the pupil role. In addition, the measure offered a sample of the mother's language style and of the appeal system used to regulate her child's behavior. Since mothers also may anticipate that most children perceive entering grade school as a big new experience, responses were coded also for affective elements, for the extent to which they showed apparent awareness of positive and negative aspects of school and were explicit concerning provision of support to the child in introducing him/her to this new situation. The extent to which the mother provided present instances of preparatory activities for school was also coded. Thus, the taped responses were scored for content, mode of communication, and strategies of maternal control.

These tasks were repeated in the child's Head Start year. Home interviews were again obtained when the children were nine years old. The process, status, and situational variables assessed by these instruments are presented below.

Process Variables

The following variables were selected on the basis of previous research suggesting their relevance for the young child's cognitive development. The interaction measures described were only obtained in Year 1, but the interview measures were obtained in both Year 1 and Year 6.

Feelings of control over environment. Broadly speaking, this variable concerns the degree to which a person feels he/she can shape and direct his/her own future and the events which affect him/her. At one extreme is a conviction that one's actions make a decisive difference in life; at the opposite extreme is a belief that the consequences of life are not under one's control but rather are determined by external conditions. Rotter (1966) has referred to this dimension of feelings as internal-external locus of control, or as a sense of powerfulness-powerlessness. The difference between a mother's desired level of educational attainment for her child and the actual level she expects is an example of a measure of her feelings of control. If this difference is large and aspirations exceed expectations, the mother's statements might be interpreted to imply an external locus of control. In turn, an external locus of control or feeling of powerlessness may mediate the development of similar beliefs in the child. Examples of other relevant interview items concern the mother's feelings of efficacy in discussing school problems with the principal and in effecting desired changes in the neighborhood. Also, a score was derived from the Etch-A-Sketch Interaction Task describing the discrepancy on each design between the mother's predicted score and the criterion.

Feelings of alienation. Closely related to feelings of efficacy is a sociological notion represented by a dimension of participation-alienation, i.e., the degree to which a family participates in activities related to the child, his/her school, their neighborhood or community, etc. An example of a measure of participation-alienation is the number and nature of organizations the mother attends. The more frequent such attendance, the more the mother might be expected to transmit to her young child an orientation that reflects such participation. Additional indices of this dimension are the mother's knowledge and utilization of community resources, voting behavior, frequency of visiting relations and neighbors, and extent of going outside the home for entertainment.

Positive control systems/influence techniques. Included in this variable are measures of attempts to engage the child's interest and cooperation through expressed or implied rewards (achievement satisfaction, mother's high positive regard, pleading, encouragement, reasoning, treats, or pleasure derived from the task itself), as well as the mother's actual use of reward in the form of praise. In contrast to the positive control techniques enumerated above which were scored only for whether or not they occurred, for the interaction sessions praise also was rated on a four-point scale in addition to recording tallies for frequency of use. These tallies were further differentiated to reflect whether the praise was elicited for effort, obedience, or competency.

Coercive control. This variable subsumes measures of the mother's tendency to attempt to regulate the child's behavior through personal criticism or through commands and directives which imply punishments for noncompliance (threats, scolding) or explicitly involve use of physical restraint or punishment. As in the case of praise, during the interaction sessions criticism also was rated for degree of use and tallied under the effort, obedience, and competency categories.

Scores also were derived for the measures subsumed by the positive or coercive control techniques to reflect the mother's tendency or preference in using either positive or coercive control techniques.

Appeal systems. The preceding control techniques are subsumed to some degree by three general types of control which constitute the appeal system variable. Briefly, the measures used here are defined as status-normative, personal-subjective, and cognitive-rational appeals. "Essential to these [the status-normative] strategies is the acceptance of rules and regulations as appropriate and unquestionable. Although sometimes useful and necessary to inform the child about authority structures and rules and to procure unquestioning obedience when necessary, these strategies require no thought or reflection by the child and may lead to a passive learning style if used exclusively. The personal-subjective strategies are appeals to subjective, internal states of the child, the mother, or other person with whom the child interacts. This strategy demands of the child a more complex cognitive process and role-playing and induces a less passive learning style requiring attention to peers and authority figures and ability to see a situation from several perspectives. The cognitive-rational appeals are based on arguments relating to the task and to future consequences of behavior. This strategy, based on a rationale of cause and effect, is considerably more complex than the previous two since it asks the child to reflect on long-range effects of his behavior. The child is asked to internalize cognitive control, providing himself with the general guidelines to apply to new situations (Hess et al., 1969, p. 42)." These variables were assessed from responses to the First Day of School Question and during the interaction sessions.

Affectionateness. This variable attempts to characterize the mother's underlying attitude toward the child (inferred from overt behavior) on a scale ranging from high positive regard (warm and loving) through neutral and unresponsive to hostile and rejecting. The three measures used were the mother's high point, low point, and most typical level on the Affectionateness Scale of the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales (Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1949). This rating is a general assessment of the mother's affective interaction with her child and is heavily weighted with both gestural and expressive components. Given potential differences due to task (and the child's task-specific behavior) these ratings were made separately for each interaction session.

Quality of attention demanded. For each interaction task, each mother was rated on a four-point scale representing increased degrees of demand for attention. Mothers rated as high on this variable were prompt to react to evidence of inattention in their child, while mothers rated low in attention-demand either made no attempt to intervene when the child's attention strayed or were unable to establish sufficient control over the child to prevent occurrence of this behavior.

Teaching specificity. Variables used to measure maternal teaching specificity during the interaction tasks included orientation of the child to the relevant task components, frequency and specificity of requests for block placement and verbal labeling, ratings on specificity of instructions to the child prior to requesting a response, and specificity of feedback. In the interaction situation specificity is construed as a continuous variable having both verbal and nonverbal aspects. It reflects the mother's clarity and precision in specifying her intended meaning and the likelihood that the child will perceive this meaning in a given communication. The verbal aspect of specificity may be described as "labeling," which refers to the mother's supplying a verbal referent for the relevant attributes of the blocks, while the nonverbal aspect or "focusing" behavior refers to supplemental nonverbal actions which attempt to focus the child's attention on the relevant attributes by making them more salient in his/her perceptual field.

Mother's verbal encouragement to reflect. This measure was added in the present study in view of the child test data available on the dimension of impulsivity-reflectivity. The mother was rated, using a four-point scale, on the degree to which she tended to make statements during the interaction sessions encouraging the child to reflect upon or consider what was required before making a given response, and a tally was made of the actual frequency of such statements.

Differentiation of the environment--knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs. The child's objective and subjective differentiation of his/her world may be influenced significantly by his/her mother's degree of objective and subjective differentiation of the environment. For example, the more knowledge and understanding a mother has about school programs, the better she can prepare her child for the intellectual, social, and affective demands of school. Other interview items were included to assess the mother's differentiation/individuation of the study child (e.g., questions concerning knowledge of the child's specific strengths and weaknesses, special interests, and favorite books, and evaluations of various indices of the child's affective, social, and cognitive functioning in comparison to other children his/her age).

Encouragement of school-related achievement and general cognitive development. This variable is tapped by a number of interview items, including the mother's educational aspirations for the child, frequency of family members' reading to the child, helping with homework in grade school, and visiting the child's preschool and grade school, the manner of responding to the child's questions, the extent to which the child is involved in decision making, and whether learning/studying is included in describing a good student. Additional indices were derived from responses to the First Day of School Question which described school-related family preparatory activities with the child at age four, expressed value in preschool attendance, and included academic learning as an important defining characteristic of grade school. Also, parental reading of newspapers and magazines and enrolling for additional school courses may be viewed as modeling of cognitive behaviors and thereby indirect stimuli for such achievement in the child, as is the availability of children's books, records, dictionaries, and encyclopedias in the home.

Status and Situational Variables

Information for identifying subpopulations. Such information consists of age, sex, and race of child; age, race, and occupation of parents; language spoken in the home; locale (urban-rural); and type of dwelling (e.g., public vs. private housing).

Educational level of parents. Number of years of schooling.

Occupational level. Duncan code for status level.

Family structure. Presence or absence of a father-figure in the home, whether or not this adult male is the biological father.

Adult availability. Defined by adult-to-child ratio.

Number of other children in the household.

Home resources. Included here are variables that have traditionally been associated with social status, e.g., availability of books, toys, radio, TV, records, etc. The logical relevance of these variables for the study is seen in the indication they may give of the amount of cognitive stimulation and/or emotional support which is available for the child.

It should be noted that changes in the above status variables may constitute a rough index for assessing the upward or downward mobility of the family during the period of the study.

Family residential mobility. Number of times family moved during the three years prior to study Year 1 and study Year 6.

Ordinal position of target child. Family size has been found to correlate with several dimensions of childrearing practice (Freeberg & Payne, 1967; Hess et al., 1968; White, Day, Freeman, Hantman, & Messenger, 1973); findings on sibling rank, however, are inconsistent (Schooler, 1972). Logically, it might be concluded that both these factors influence the extent to which a parent can engage in a variety of activities which inherently require sustained participation.

Potential "stress" conditions. It is hypothesized that a number of family conditions may serve to constrict the child's psychological environment and create a stressful living situation. Among such conditions are instability or frequent mobility of the family; severe or recurrent illness in the family; erratic vs. relatively steady employment history; physical and psychological "depression" of the home and surroundings--e.g., maintenance of the dwelling inside and out; lighting conditions inside the home; potential hazards in the neighborhood (broken glass, location near a bar); crowding in the home, etc.

Child's possessions--material objects and living space. Insofar as possible, information was obtained on the number of things (books, toys, etc.) the child possessed, whether he/she had a designated space in the house for personal things (a closet or drawer space), and whether places (a room, a bed) were available for the child's private use. This variable seems particularly important for the economically disadvantaged child, who often has nothing to call his/her own nor any place in which he/she may escape for peace and solitude.

Child's range of mobility. Relevant to the amount of environmental stimulation is diversity in the environment. Where is the child allowed to play? Where is he/she allowed to go in the neighborhood? On what excursions outside the home is he/she taken (supermarket, visiting relatives, etc.)?

Beyond providing a detailed picture of the study families over the six-year span of the study, the above-listed variables should enable us to determine *how* the environment created in the family affects the child's experience with what specific consequences for the child. By defining those factors of poverty which may be regarded as truly impoverishing, we would hope to provide evidence for appropriate alternatives to or counter attacks on those patterns of impoverishment.

More concretely, the instability of frequent residential moves, severe or recurrent illness, erratic vs. a relatively steady employment history, and physical or psychological depression of home residences may cause severe stress on the child. The ways in which the child reacts or copes with these home stress situations may interrelate directly with his/her ability to perform in school or in other cognitive-demanding situations. In addition, the transmission of attitudes is considered to be of major significance in the child's development; how the child sees and defines his/her world will determine how he/she chooses to behave. Changes, therefore, in parental attitudes toward school or knowledge and use of community resources, for example, may have profound effects on the child's desire or ability to accomplish or succeed.

Children's Cognitive Functioning

For this report, attention was limited to those measures assessing the child's acquisition of the basic skills of reading and math in third grade. To aid interpretation a less directly school-related measure of reasoning and problem-solving abilities also was included. In addition, for those analyses assessing the influence of early family variables on the child's later cognitive-perceptual functioning, the child's performance at age four on the Preschool Inventory (PSI) was used as a covariate so that the unique contribution of family variables to such predictions could be determined. These measures are described in the following section.

Measures of Academic Achievement

Cooperative Primary Tests--Reading. The Cooperative Primary Tests are a national standardized achievement test battery developed by ETS and designed for use in grades one through three. The tests are group administered, with the child responding by making an "X" on the one of the three response alternatives that he/she believes is correct. There is no special instruction to the student about guessing, and there is no correction for guessing in the scoring. The teacher is instructed to allow a reasonable amount of time for all students to finish. In order to provide practice with this type of item, the pilot test included in the test package was administered first. The Reading test consists of 50 items, some of which assess the comprehension of individual words, while others require the student to extract a key element from a sentence or paragraph, or provide some interpretation, evaluation, or inference based on the sentence or paragraph (Cooperative Primary Tests, ETS, 1967). Form 23B was administered in third grade (Year 6).

Cooperative Primary Tests--Math. In this 60-item test the following topics are covered: number, symbolism, operation, function and relation, approximation, proof, measurement, estimation, and geometry. Straight computation is not emphasized, but rather an attempt is made " . . . to test major concepts of mathematics in their emergent state" (Cooperative Primary Tests, ETS, 1967). Form 23B was administered in third grade (Year 6).

Measure of Problem-Solving Ability

Raven Colored Progressive Matrices (Booklet Version). Developed for use with young children and retarded or impaired adults for whom the standard series of Progressive Matrices is inappropriate, the Colored Progressive Matrices contains 36 items divided into three sets of increasing difficulty (A, Ab, and B). Each item represents a pattern with a piece missing; the child is asked to select (from a set of six alternative pictures) the piece that correctly completes the pattern. Compared to the measures listed above, this task is more a measure of problem-solving ability and less a measure of specific school learning. It assesses the individual's ability to make perceptual discriminations, to compare, and to reason by analogy. It is also a kind of learning-to-learn task in that the child who learns efficient strategies on the beginning relatively easy items will have greater success as the items become increasingly difficult. This test was individually administered.

Measure of Preacademic Skills

Preschool Inventory (PSI). The PSI, developed by Caldwell for use in Project Head Start as a general achievement test for preschool children, taps a range of verbal, quantitative, and perceptual-motor skills defined by teachers as expected of children in kindergarten. The items for the present 64-item revision are classified in the Inventory manual (ETS, 1970) into four major categories: Personal-Social responses (18 items, e.g., "How old are you?", "Raise your hand."); Association Vocabulary (12 items, e.g., "What does a dentist do?"); Concept Activation--Numerical (19 items, e.g., "How many wheels does a car have?"); Concept Activation--Sensory (19 items, e.g., "Which is heavier, a brick or a shoe?"). However, the Inventory Handbook (ETS, 1970) advises against the determination of subset scores, and factor analyses of Longitudinal Study data and Head Start Planned Variation Study data (Walker, Bane, & Bryk, 1973) have not supported their use. About 60% of the items require an oral response. The PSI has been widely administered to Head Start children (e.g., Research Triangle Institute, 1972; Walker et al., 1973). Statistical information on the standardization sample for the 1970 Revised Edition (64-items) is contained in the Handbook. Since child testing in Year 1 occurred throughout the spring and summer of 1969, and since at this age performance level on the PSI was known to improve noticeably even over a period of a few months (Shipman, 1972b), age at time of testing was partialled out of the scores to yield an age-corrected PSI score.

In the factor analysis of the Year 1 individual child test data, performance on the PSI had the highest loading on the first factor, which appeared to represent general cognitive ability, and it is the single task in the Longitudinal Study battery most clearly associated with general cognitive development. Thus, the PSI was selected for the current report to function as a covariate so that the unique contribution of family variables to predictions of later cognitive-perceptual functioning could be determined. From both a theoretical and practical standpoint it was desired to determine whether the family measures shared any variance with later cognitive-perceptual measures that was independent of the variance that they initially shared with the PSI, i.e., that any influence observed on later performance was more than an indirect influence via effects arising from early childhood behaviors.

Chapter 5

DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Year 6 Descriptive Statistics

Since descriptive information and results of internal correlational analysis for the Year 1 Parent Interview were already available (ETS, 1970; Shipman, 1972a), the first step in the current analysis was to obtain similar information for the Year 6 Parent Interview. Questionnaire distributions were run, consisting of frequencies and percent responding for each response category on every item. This information was delineated according to site, race, preschool experience (Head Start, other preschool, or no known attendance), and sex of child, as well as for the total sample. Prior to correlational analysis, all interview items were reviewed for a priori scaling and possible score reduction. Results of the Year 1 interview analysis thus not only influenced the construction of the Year 6 interview but also were helpful in indicating potentially meaningful item clusters. For those items that seemed highly homogeneous in content and format, subscores were derived and point biserial correlations and alpha coefficients obtained.

Year 6 Correlation Matrix

A missing-data Pearson product-moment correlation matrix was then obtained containing all of the scorable items and derived item cluster scores with satisfactorily high alpha coefficients. In addition, the matrix also contained Year 6 scores on Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices, Cooperative Primary Reading and Math Tests, plus dummy variables for sex, race, preschool attendance, Follow Through enrollment, and site. Thus, information was available on the interrelationships among family status, situational, and process variables and on the relationship of these variables to the child's cognitive-perceptual performance. Since previous research suggested differences in mean level and patterns of correlations according to race and sex of child, separate matrices were provided by race and by sex within race subgroups. To assess the relationship of Head Start attendance to interview scores and relationships in Year 6, separate matrices were obtained for families who enrolled the study child in Head Start and those whose child attended no preschool program. Given the small number of white children who attended Head Start these analyses were obtained for black families only.

Longitudinal Comparisons

After the relationships among the Year 6 variables were determined, the scores from the Year 1 interview were correlated with the Year 6 interview and the selected cognitive-perceptual scores. These data for the longitudinal sample provided comparison of mean levels and variability on similar items across years, stability of patterns among family variables, and the extent of early family influence on the child's cognitive-perceptual performance at age nine. The nature and extent of significant differences in responses to identical items across years were assessed according to site and within site by race, preschool attendance, and sex of child. Where items or item clusters were assessing similar constructs in both years, part correlations also were used to remove statistically effects of Year 1 status on that construct from the Year 6 correlations between the interview variable and cognitive-perceptual scores. Thus, if no change occurred or if changes that occurred were unrelated to cognitive-perceptual performance, the part correlation would be zero, while a significant non-zero part correlation would indicate that knowledge of status on that variable in Year 6 added significantly to predictions based on Year 1 status on that variable (i.e., change on that variable was related to the child's cognitive-perceptual performance). Note that this part correlation is exactly the same as the part correlation of the gain score (from Year 1 to Year 6) with the criterion when controlling for Year 1 interview scores, but the current approach does not demand the computation of a gain score for each individual or that the scale of the variables in the two years be directly comparable (though, of course, the analysis is only sensible if scores in both years are assessing the same construct). This approach, while slightly less direct, eliminates a number of the serious measurement problems inherent in raw change score analysis.

In order to identify those early status, situational, and process variables that had a measurable continuing influence on the child's cognitive development as opposed to those whose predictive ability was already reflected in his/her cognitive level at age four, correlations were computed between Year 1 interview variables and the Year 6 cognitive-perceptual scores after statistically controlling the relationship of the interview variables to the child's initial cognitive level. Specifically, part (or semi-partial) correlations were used to indicate the variables that contributed to predictions of Year 6 Reading, Math, and Raven scores over and above what could have been predicted solely from children's Year 1 Preschool Inventory (PSI) scores. In addition to the "continuing influence" hypothesis mentioned above, significant part correlations also would be expected for family variables that were related to components of the Year 6 cognitive-perceptual measures that were not measured or were inadequately assessed in the Year 1 Preschool Inventory.

Regression Analyses

With a set of interrelated status, situational, and process variables, the question can be asked to what extent early indicators of family process predict third-grade cognitive-perceptual performance over and above what could have been predicted solely from status and situational measures and vice-versa. To answer these questions, a hierarchical multiple regression technique was used in which the independent variables were grouped into sets. The increment in the proportion of variance accounted for by each new set, over and above the variance accounted for by the preceding sets, was noted.

Theoretically important Year 1 interview variables were screened for minimally acceptable psychometric properties (e.g., reasonable variance), and some other variables were eliminated because of near-zero correlations with the third-grade criterion scores. Thus, some variables which *a priori* seemed of theoretical interest were eliminated, but no variable was included just because it correlated significantly with the criterion measures. Process measures were arranged into three sets that went from relatively direct to more indirect influences on the child's behavior. Set 1 included four items which assessed direct mother-child interactions (amount of maternal reading to child, the mother's use of rationales in response to her child's misbehavior, her response to a question from the child that she couldn't answer, and the use of physical vs. verbal punishment for minor misbehavior); Set 2 consisted of just one item that assessed the mother's educational expectations for her child; Set 3 contained three scores that assessed the mother's personal activities (amount of magazine reading, extent of participation in voting, and number of groups of which mother is a member). The status and situational variables were arranged in two sets. The first set was a measure of the child's physical environment and consisted of number of selected home possessions and the crowding index (number of rooms/persons); the second set consisted of the more traditional SES indicators, head-of-household occupation and mother's education, plus race of the child.

A multiple regression analysis was run first entering the three process sets (in order) followed by the two status/situational sets, then a second regression was run entering first the two status/situational sets followed by the three process sets. The additional predictive power of the child's performance at age four on the Preschool Inventory after controlling for family background was assessed by entering the age-adjusted PSI score after all the process, situational, and status variables. The effect of preschool attendance on third-grade cognitive-perceptual performance, controlling for initial level and family background, was assessed by adding this 0-1 score last in the regression equations. A supplementary analysis investigated the additional predictive power of selected scores from the mother-child interaction tasks and the First Day of School Question by adding them after the process measures from the interview. Each regression was run separately for the sample of boys and girls, as well as for the total sample. A separate regression equation was run for each of the three dependent variables (Year 6 Reading, Math, and Raven scores). Thus, each of the three questions (process followed by status, status followed by process, and process plus interaction scores followed by status) required nine regression equations (3 dependent variables x 3 samples).

Chapter 6

STUDY FAMILIES IN YEAR 6

In this chapter a detailed description is provided of the findings from analysis of the responses of the 1212 respondents in the three study sites who were administered the Year 6 Parent Interview. In the first section, percentages are provided for responses to specific interview items within status/situational and process areas. This is followed by a description of the relationships obtained within and among status, situational, and process variables. Results for the process variables are further delineated with patterns of correlations described within and between *a priori* item clusters. Salient differences in response frequencies and patterns according to the three study sites, race, study children's sex, and the three categories of their preschool attendance also are described. As noted earlier in the sample description in Chapter 2, these differences must be interpreted cautiously because of the confounded relationships among major classifications of families such as site, race, socioeconomic status, and category of study child's preschool experience. Several status/situational characteristics of families in Year 6 are contrasted also with national census data.

Status and Situational Characteristics

Ninety-three percent of respondents were the mothers of study children; another 6% were foster mothers, step-mothers, or adult female relatives. Seven respondents were male caretakers in households where no mother or female mother-surrogate lived. Median ages of mothers and fathers were 35 and 37, respectively. As contrasted with 15% for the general population, 36% of study children lived in single-parent families. According to data from the 1974 Census, mothers of over half the nation's school-age children were working. Similarly, 43% of study mothers were employed full-time, and an additional 12% were employed part-time. Of those employed, most had jobs as service workers (41%), clerical workers (19%), or operatives (17%). Half of them had worked in their present jobs for at least two years. Of the mothers not working, 40% had worked within the two preceding years but 79% reported they were not now looking for work.

Seventy-nine percent of mothers reported that fathers (presently living in the home or not) were employed, 10% reported them as unemployed, and 11% said they did not know. Of those employed, most (89%) worked full-time. Most fathers (67%) were employed in blue-collar jobs, the majority as operatives (25%), and craftsmen (21%); 22% had unskilled jobs and 16% were classified as professionals. Fifty-eight percent of employed fathers were reported to have worked at the same job for at least the five preceding years. Eighteen percent of mothers, however, said they relied primarily on public assistance for income to support their families.

Mother's formal education ranged from 1 to 20 years with a mean of 10.9 years. Sixteen percent had completed grade school only; 13% had completed two or more years of college. Father's (present or not) education ranged from 1 to 20 years; the mean level was 11.1 years. Twenty-three percent of fathers had completed grade school only; 20% had completed two or more years of college.

Two-thirds of study families lived in single-unit housing with nearly as many mothers (61%) reporting that they owned their homes. Sixteen percent lived in duplexes or row houses while 6% lived in garden apartments and 2% lived in high-rise apartments; 11% resided in public housing projects. Interviewers' ratings of families' residences indicated that most families (71%) lived in old houses and most homes (62%) had well-maintained exteriors; 70% were in low or moderate noise environments, and 82% had adequate outside space where children could play. Thirty percent of house exteriors were judged to be in poor repair; noise levels were rated as high and "distracting" for 8% of study families.

The average study household comprised 5.8 residents in a unit of 6.1 rooms. The mean index of crowding, a ratio of rooms-to-people, was 1.18. Adult availability, measured by the ratio of adults-to-children, averaged 0.52 representing means of 2.0 adults and 3.8 children in study family households. There was considerable range in household size, however. Families interviewed in Year 6 comprised one to thirteen children, with consequent wide ranges in crowding and adult availability. Twelve percent of households comprised at least nine members.

Sixty-seven percent of mothers reported that the study child shared his/her bedroom with others in the household, usually with other children of the same sex (81%). However, sleeping rooms were shared with opposite-sex children in 10% of such cases and with parents or other adult caretakers in 5%. Twenty-two percent of study children reportedly did not have a bed of their own, 24% had neither a closet nor section of a closet for their own use, and 15% had no separate dresser drawer or clothes chest facilities.

There was at least one television, radio, and phonograph in virtually every household, but 10% had no dictionary, 17% no vacuum cleaner, 18% no telephone, 23% no car, and 35% no encyclopedia. Nearly all children had their own toys; approximately three-fifths had phonograph records, board games, bicycles, or paints; about one-half had construction toys, musical instruments, or pets; few (12%) had a science kit. Of course, many of these materials were jointly owned with other family members.

Thirty-six percent of study families interviewed had changed residences within the three years preceding the interview. Of those families who had moved, 30% had changed residences more than once. Sixty-six percent of those who had moved recently indicated the new residence was better than the previous one (13% said worse). Mothers reported on the average that they had lived in the same house or apartment for 6.0 years (study children's mean age was 8.6 years at the time of the parent interview), in the same neighborhood for 9.8 years, and in the same town for 20.0 years; 31% of the mothers had been born in the same town, 56% in the same geographic region. These figures obviously reflect the fact that families were not interviewed who 1) moved out of the site or 2) moved so frequently we were unable to track them.

In the spring of 1974, according to the respondents, 90% of study children were in third grade, 8% had been retained in second grade, 2% had advanced to fourth grade, and approximately one percent were enrolled in special ungraded classes. Eleven percent of children were reported to be in Follow Through classes; 10% were described to be in remedial programs.

Thirteen percent of mothers said that the study child had been seriously ill or injured within the three years prior to the interview. Although most study children (85%) reportedly visited a physician at least once in that same period, with 57% having gone three or more times, 15% had not been examined by a doctor since they entered grade school. Twenty-one percent of mothers indicated that the study child had present dental problems. Only 51% of mothers reported that the study child had visited a dentist in the year of the interview, although 69% had done so in the preceding year. In 16% of study families there was one member with a serious chronic illness.

Process Variables

As mentioned in the introduction to this report, the main interest in the interview findings lies not in the status of study children and their families, but rather in the developmental dynamics of the interactions between children and family members. Those process variables assessed in the present study were described in Chapter 4. Thus, while status and situational characteristics of families indicate various opportunities or potentials available to children as a part of their psychological and physical environments, it is the process variables that suggest the functions and interactions within families that influence children's development. Such processes, of course, may have complex interdependencies with these status and situational factors, as is suggested by the findings reported later in this chapter.

Household Interactions Between Mothers and Children

One category of process variables concerns the nature and frequency of mother-child interactions. Half the mothers indicated that study children were with them at least 4.2 hours on the average during weekdays; 10% said they spend eight hours or more and approximately the same number reported spending two hours or less. On weekend days with no school or job to attend, mothers spent more time with study children: half the mothers reported spending at least 10.0 hours per day with study children; 94% reported spending at least four hours per day. During these times on weekdays, mothers reported they were usually doing housework. On weekends, activities outside the home (e.g., visiting relatives, shopping, attending church) were reported most frequently. Although the high values reported suggest some ambiguity in the item, the nature of activities described indicates a much smaller amount of direct parent-child interaction.

Some of the interview items focused on the nature of several specific interaction situations. For example, mothers were asked to recall what they had done the last time the study child's behavior had angered or annoyed them: 61% of the mothers mentioned some form of physical punishment, 54% mentioned verbal reprimands, and 11% reportedly gave the child a verbal explanation for their anger (categories of responses are not mutually exclusive). The most common physical punishments were spanking (40%) and confinement (20%); verbal reprimands included demands for children to stop misbehaving (45%), scolding (28%), and threats of physical punishment (11%). When study children had done something that pleased their mothers, they reportedly responded most often with verbal encouragement (51%), but some (13%) reported monetary rewards, and some (8%) described affectionate behaviors such as hugs and kisses (categories are not independent).

Additional responses concerning the nature and frequency of family interactions were suggested by mothers' reports of study children's participation in certain household discussions and decisions. Thirty-seven percent of study children reportedly participated frequently in discussions concerning the selection of clothes to wear to school and how they would spend money given to them; a smaller proportion participated frequently in deciding what time they should go to bed (33%), discussing their playmates (29%), and in determining how often they could watch television (27%). Many mothers reported no participation by the study child in decisions about bedtime (33%), clothes to wear to school (25%), television-viewing (24%), playmates (24%), or spending money (21%).

Several other interview items probed household interactions which concerned mothers' preparing or assisting study children with school-related activities. For example, mothers indicated what they would do if the child asked a difficult question that they could not answer. Mothers responded (categories are mutually exclusive) they would: look up the answer and explain (34%), send children to a source of information (17%), accompany children to a source (10%), say they did not know the answer (14%), or respond the best they could (10%). Nine percent indicated they would change the subject; 1% reportedly ignored such questions.

Although most mothers said they helped their child at least once a week with his/her homework, 35% of mothers reported they did not usually help the study child with homework assignments. Of course, giving such help is dependent in part upon the child's willingness and need for it and the frequency of home assignments. Of those who did report giving help, 23% helped once a week, 13% three times a week, and 26% daily. Seventy-five percent of mothers who reported helping with homework indicated that on the day preceding the interview they had worked for at least 15 minutes; 37% reported spending at least one hour. In 60% of the families, the mother said other members helped sometimes with the child's homework. Siblings and fathers accounted for 60% and 22% of such assistance, respectively.

Two-thirds of the mothers said they read stories to the study child. several times a week in 23% of the cases, once in a while in 48%. In 60% of the households, other family members also read to the child, usually older siblings (61%) or fathers (22%). In addition, in 65% of the families study children reportedly read to other children.

Mothers' General Interests and Activities Outside the Home

A second group of family process variables represents experiences mothers have regularly which are likely to influence directly or indirectly aspects of their interactions with their children and act as a indirect stimulus to their children's cognitive development. For example, most mothers (87%) reportedly read newspapers; 37% said they usually read at least two newspapers; 13% said they read none. Mothers who read one newspaper typically read a local daily (in 94% of the cases) every day (72%) or several days a week (18%). Local weekly papers were the most frequently read second paper. Mothers were asked also whether they read any magazines. Those mothers that did were encouraged to describe as many as three publications. More than a quarter of the sample (27%) reported reading three or more magazines. The kind of publication and frequency of reading were coded for each of the three magazines. Home-and-family publications and news magazines were mentioned most frequently (approximately 40% and 15%, respectively). Frequency of reading was at least once-a-month in 70% of the responses.

Another group of interview items relating to mothers' activities outside the household involved reported visits to homes of nearby relatives and friends, excursions for shopping and for entertainment, and attendance at religious services. Seventy-four percent of the mothers reportedly visited at least one relative and at least one friend; 42% and 44% reported visiting three relatives or friends, respectively. Frequencies of such visits ranged from once-a-week or more to less than once-a-month. Mothers took study children along in at least 90% of reported visits to relatives; for visits to friends, children reportedly accompanied mothers on at least 75% of such visits. Mothers reported that they visited at least one place of entertainment in 62% of study families, three or more places in 26%. Frequencies of such trips ranged from once-a-week to less than once-a-month; study children went along on at least 64% of such excursions. Similarly, study children went with mothers on shopping excursions downtown or into the city in about 53% of such trips. Eighty-four percent of mothers reported that they attended church, 44% once-a-week or more often, 19% less than once-a-month. Study children who accompanied mothers to church (94%) went at least once-a-week in 52% of the cases. For the above findings it should be noted that the 26% of mothers who reportedly never visited a relative or friend and the 38% who never went outside the home for entertainment represent a sizeable minority of families.

The interview also assessed mothers' participation in other activities outside the home including voting in the national elections and membership in various organizations. Sixty-three percent of mothers said they had voted in the national election of 1972; another 10% reportedly had voted in earlier national elections but not in 1972; 26% said they had never voted. Most frequently mentioned explanations for not voting were: "no reason" (45%), not registered (29%), disinterest (6%), and feelings of futility (6%). Group memberships were few in the present sample. Thirty-five percent of mothers belonged to education-related groups, 25% belonged to groups connected with religious organizations, 16% to social groups, 7% to neighborhood action groups, and 11% to other groups such as job-affiliated organizations. For the same groups, mothers held offices in 15%, 37%, 34%, 28%, and 20% of the cases, respectively. As would be expected, frequencies of attendance were greater for religious and social groups (once or twice a week) than for community action or education-related groups (once a month). For mothers who attended more than one group, religious organizations were ranked most important, education-related groups second.

Mothers' Participation in School-Related Activities

Several interview items probed the nature and degree of the mother's participation in activities related directly to the study child's schooling. Most mothers did not participate in matters related directly to their child's classroom program. Only 9% of mothers reported that they had attended meetings of parent-advisory groups or class meetings about study children's programs. Seven percent said they had helped to decide about class programs, but only 30% of such decisions reportedly concerned curriculum. Of those mothers who had not made such input, nearly half (49%) said there was no opportunity to do so, another 18% reportedly were unable to attend meetings, 8% said they were not interested, and 2% said that it was the responsibility of other people or that they felt personally inadequate to contribute to decisions about class programs. Seventy-eight percent of mothers responded, however, that they had had sufficient opportunities to learn about study children's school experiences. Among mothers of study children who had attended preschool, 30% indicated an increase in opportunities for involvement in school activities compared to when their children were in preschool, 30% indicated less opportunity, and 40% indicated opportunities remained about the same. More mothers were involved in more general school-related activities. Forty-six percent reported having attended at least one PTA meeting in the preceding year; 22% reported attending three or more times. Also, 43% said they had attended at least one special program and 12% and 23%, respectively, reported helping at least once in the study child's classroom and with at least one party or field trip.

Eighty percent of interview respondents provided specific names when asked to identify study children's classroom teachers; 19%, however, did not know the name of their child's teacher. More than two-thirds of the mothers (68%) had attended at least one school conference with study children's teachers; 19% had met with the teacher more than twice during the school year. Thirty-two percent of these conferences reportedly resulted from requests by the mother, 59% from requests by the teacher or other school personnel.

The above reported description of participation in school activities reflects, of course, not only the respondent's desire for such involvement, but the opportunity provided by the school both formally and informally by the satisfaction experienced by the parent in the situation. Responses also reflect the opportunity provided through lack of conflict with other demands (e.g., the parent's job, other children at home requiring supervision).

Mothers' Feelings of Satisfaction and Efficacy

One index of a mother's satisfaction with her family's circumstances is her willingness to recommend her neighborhood as a place of residence for friends. Fifty-seven percent of the mothers in this sample replied affirmatively, however 37% did not make such recommendations and referred to general adverse conditions such as crowding, litter, or noise (10%), bad neighbors (5%), unsafe conditions (5%), or some combination of these (67%). The same proportion of mothers (37%) responded that they would like to move from their present house or apartment. Forty-three percent of mothers responded that they had wanted certain changes or improvements in their neighborhoods and referred to maintenance of municipal facilities such as streets and sewage (27%), maintenance of neighborhood residences (21%), availability of community facilities such as playgrounds and shopping centers (14%), housing (8%), and schools (11%). Fifty-six percent of the mothers who had wanted such changes reported that they had not occurred. Ten percent of the mothers reported that neighborhood conditions were so bad that is was unsafe for study children to play outside.

When asked if they would join their neighbors in attempts to make changes in neighborhoods or local schools, 60% of the respondents replied negatively or said they didn't know (52% felt no changes were necessary). Seventy-seven percent of the remaining mothers believed that such cooperative efforts could succeed and mentioned targets such as municipal utilities and streets (22%), general neighborhood maintenance (19%), schools (19%), community facilities (17%), and housing (5%).

Mothers also were asked if they felt that they themselves could improve local schools. Only 52% of mothers responded positively, mentioning contributions such as attending meetings or joining PTA groups (24%), working for specific improvements such as better equipment or programs (20%), and unspecified involvement (32%). Mothers who said they could not effect such improvements (27% of the total sample with an additional 11% who responded "don't know") cited other demands on their time (23%), no need for such involvement (22%), personal feelings of inability or inadequacy (15%), inability to do things alone (14%), and a general sense of powerlessness (i.e., "no one would listen to me" [11%]). In a related query, mothers were asked if they felt they could do something about disagreements with their child's school principal. To this more specific question, eighty-six percent responded affirmatively (with 55% feeling they could do something about it sometimes and 31%, most times), 5% said they didn't know, and 9% said "no."

Mothers' General Knowledge and Use of Community Resources

Mothers' responses reflected differential awareness and availability of various community resources including: nursery school or day-care center (80%), clinic (84%), hospital (96%), summer day camp (39%), after-class school-led programs (37%), teen center (43%), public library (83%), public playgrounds (76%), public park (76%), art gallery (32%), museum (42%), live theater (45%), auditorium (59%), and zoo (34%). Mothers' uncertainty about available resources reflected by percentages of "don't know" responses, concerned summer day camp (22%), after-class school-led programs (17%), teen center (19%), art gallery (17%), museum (10%), and live theater (13%).

Most mothers (82%) knew whether adult educational programs were or were not available in study children's schools, but only 27% of the 21% who said they were available reported participating in such programs. When asked where they would take study children if they became ill, 44% mentioned a specific physician, 40% specified a hospital or clinic, and 14% described some combination of specific doctor at specific clinic, hospital, or medical center; only three respondents said they wouldn't know what to do in such circumstances. Respondents also were asked if they had contacted organizations or individuals in their communities for help with educational, legal, or employment problems. Twenty-four percent reported such contacts for educational problems, mostly with school personnel; 15% reported assistance in legal matters, mostly from private attorneys; and 11% reported help from state agencies or local employers with employment problems.

Mothers' Attitudes About Education and Local Schools and Teachers

Several interview questions probed the mother's attitudes about education in general and about the study child's school in particular. It is assumed that mothers' positive or optimistic attitudes about their community and schools are likely to be transmitted to their children and that these attitudes are reinforced by mothers' participation in related activities. Also, mothers' responses to these items may indicate conditions to which study children are exposed. For example, most mothers (78%) thought that teachers do as much as they can to teach all children; only 15% thought teachers were doing less than they could; 2% felt teachers did very much less than they could. Likewise, most mothers (63%) indicated that their child's present teacher had done a "very good" job of teaching; 30%, however, rated teachers as only "pretty good"; and 5% gave "poor" ratings. Study children's teachers were evaluated as equal to other local teachers by 76% of mothers; only 3% thought their child's teachers were inferior to others in the same community.

Most mothers (80%) said they believed teachers want to have discussions with parents about school-related matters; 16% thought teachers were not so disposed. However, only forty-three percent of mothers thought that most teachers understand problems faced by local residents; 46% indicated only some teachers understand, and 6% believed hardly any teachers understand local concerns. Most mothers (86%) thought their children's schools had buildings and equipment as good as or better than other schools in the community; 10% indicated worse facilities. Sixty percent of mothers said that at least some local classrooms were overcrowded; 13% thought there were too many children in all classrooms; only 14% said no classes were overcrowded.

From a more general perspective on education, mothers described hypothetical "good students" and "good teachers"--open-ended items in which responses could refer to more than one category. According to these descriptions, good students: are obedient and cooperative (54%), study or try their best in school work (43%), earn good grades (24%), are interested and self-motivated in school (22%), interact well with classmates and participate in school activities (14%), and are trustworthy and dependable (6%). Thus, the dominant pupil role for which the child is apparently being socialized is one of obedience. Good teachers were described as: patient and understanding (66%), enforce rules and regulate students' conduct (17%), modify instruction to accommodate individual capabilities and interests (16%), are trained professionally in principles of the education and development of young children (14%), stimulate interest, curiosity, and creativity among students (9%), and communicate with parents about school matters (4%).

In accord with recent Gallup Poll findings (Gallup, 1976), mothers in this sample thought those primarily to be blamed if children do not achieve well in school work are parents (34%) and the children themselves (20%). The two next most cited reasons were other children who provide a bad influence and teachers (16% each). Approximately half of the mothers (49%) thought that schools would not benefit from increased parental control; 16% thought such involvement would make no difference, but 22% approved more parental control. More than one-fourth of the respondents (29%) felt children must be coerced to learn at least some things; 23% thought it was appropriate for parents to keep children out of school once in a while to help at home.

Mothers' evaluations of future educational and vocational opportunities were generally favorable and optimistic: 82% thought that any capable applicant to college could be admitted, with financial inadequacy the most frequently cited limitation (12%). Nearly as many mothers (81%) reportedly felt that upon graduation from college their children could find equally desirable and well-paying jobs as other graduates.

Information was obtained also about mothers' satisfaction regarding their own schooling. Sixty-one percent expressed satisfaction with their educations, of these 38% were "very satisfied;" 37% were not satisfied, of these 39% were "very dissatisfied." Forty percent of mothers reportedly had supplemented their educational backgrounds by attending programs including: vocational education (30%), basic adult education (17%), university courses (16%), specialized degrees (15%), junior college (12%), and high school equivalency (7%).

Mothers' Expectations for Study Children

As noted in Chapter 4, mothers' feelings of an external locus of control or personal powerlessness over environmental events may be inferred from expressions of relatively high aspirations but lower expectations. The amount of discrepancy also may be viewed as an index of optimism-pessimism. With respect to future educational attainments by study children, 57% of mothers wanted the child at least to graduate from college, whereas only 24% expected such achievements. Similarly, although 64% said they wanted the study child to complete at least two years of college, only 32% expected him or her to do so. Of those mothers citing reasons for study children not attaining aspired levels, 36% mentioned insufficient motivation, 28% financial problems, 17% marriage, and 15% other interference such as military service or illness. A similar difference between desired and expected attainment occurred in mothers' projections of the child's adult occupation; 59% of mothers said they would like their child to have a professional or managerial job whereas only 37% actually expected this to occur.

Other indices of mothers' expectations of study children's achievements were mean ages at which mothers expected the study child should perform certain activities and responsibilities and perform them well. These responses also reflect the mothers' press for independence in their children. On most of these items there was a considerable range of responses. For example, 30% of the mothers indicated that at age eight the study child could already attend public events alone, while 24% indicated s/he should be expected to do this at 11 or 12, and over 16% indicated that the child should be age 13 or older. The item on the age at which the child should be able to participate in adult conversations showed a particularly large range, with 57% of the mothers indicating that the child could and did already do it at age eight but with another 30% indicating an expected age of 13 or older.

Mothers' Perceptions of Study Children

Study children were generally viewed by their mothers as similar to their age peers. Judged by their mothers and compared to their age peers, study children cried less (53%), acted older (51%), were less afraid (54%), and were easier to get along with (50%); a smaller percentage had fewer temper tantrums (48%), asked more questions (47%), spoke better (34%), and were happier (42%). For each of these items, about 10% of the respondents indicated "poorer-than-average" ratings. Similarly, slightly less than half the mothers indicated the study child was "very" independent (46%), popular (48%), and had encountered few problems learning to read (46%). A majority of mothers rated the child as ambitious in both sports and games, and school work (61%) and as having adjusted relatively easily to first grade (57%). Again, only about 10% of respondents reported significantly below-average evaluations. As noted above, however, mothers' evaluations were not uniformly favorable. Also, many mothers differentiated between intent and consequences. While many (61%) thought their child tried very hard to do well in sports and games, fewer (36%) felt he/she actually performed very well. Similarly, more than half said their child tried very hard in his/her school work but only 28% considered him/her to be doing "better than average" work. Mothers were concerned also about their child's ability to stay with a task until it was completed (only 25%

were reported to be "very good" at it compared to 38% "pretty good" and 33% "not so good").

Mothers were asked to describe what they thought the study child liked to do most. Frequently mentioned responses referred to athletic activities such as playing ball or skating (28%), school-related activities (24%), expressive or artistic interests (12%), watching TV or role-playing activities (5% each), and unspecified play (23%). Hobbies and special interests of study children were reported by 63% of mothers. These could be categorized as follows: athletics (34%), arts and crafts (24%), school tasks (14%), music and drama (10%), model construction, and animal or plant care (7% each). In addition, mothers reported study children's likes and dislikes about school: academic subjects were mentioned as a positive aspect by 34% of mothers and as a negative aspect by 30%; gym or recess by 20% and 3%, respectively, and other children by 13% and 5%, respectively; 16% of mothers did not know what, if anything, their child disliked about school.

Mothers also described what they perceived as their child's strong and weak points. These descriptions were later classified according to the following categories: cooperativeness and obedience (40% and 26%, respectively), self-help and resourcefulness (20% and 14%, respectively), gross and fine motor skills, including athletic behavior (18% and 10%), expressiveness or artistic talent (15% and 2%), and personal qualities (e.g., persistence, patience, independence; 12% each). At least one strong or weak point was mentioned by 94% and 80% of mothers, respectively. Also, according to their mothers most children could, at age 8, behave well in company (81%), do household chores (77%), stand up for their rights with older children (76%), read books unassisted (75%), and stay home alone for several hours (63%). As would be expected, fewer children were reportedly able to make dinner (38%), or go to public entertainment places by themselves (30%).

Eighty-five percent of mothers reported that the study child had at least one special friend; 13% reported the child had no special friends; and 2% of respondents said they didn't know. Sixty-two percent of mothers reported that the study child had no worrisome problems; however, 10% of mothers expressed concern about physical problems, 8% about emotional problems, 6% about school-related problems, and 3% referred to social problems.

Mothers indicated that 56% of study children had at least ten books of their own to read and 44% had library cards; 67% brought home library books to read at least once a week. When asked to name their child's favorite books or stories, 50% of mothers gave specific titles, 15% genres, 8% vague types; 22% did not know their child's favorite books.

Mothers also were asked about study children's television viewing. The reported median daily viewing time for study children on weekdays was 2.5 hours with 24% watching for 4 hours or longer; 1.5% watched no TV on weekdays. On weekend days, median daily viewing time was 4.4 hours with 13% who watched 6 hours a day or more; 2.8% reportedly watched no TV on weekends. Sixty-one percent of study children reportedly watched programs on public broadcasting channels, every day in 33% of such cases. When asked what programs their child watched on these channels, 11% of the mothers mentioned Sesame Street or Electric Company; 10% said they did no know what programs the child watched.

As the above responses indicate, in providing descriptions of their children, respondents also demonstrated the level of individuation in their perceptions, and expressed their personal attitudes, values, and expectations.

Group Differences

The preceding description of the distribution of interview responses for the total sample is modified in some respects when families within the major classifications of site, race, sex of study child, and study child's preschool experience are contrasted. To avoid cumbersome details, salient group differences are described in general terms; comparative descriptions refer to the preceding summary for the total sample.

Differences among sites. The greatest contrast among families in the three sites was between the rural southern site in Lee County, on the one hand, and the two urban sites in Trenton and Portland, on the other. Study families in Lee County on the average appeared to be least impoverished. This must not be interpreted as indicating that poverty is less severe in rural areas, but only as a reflection of the relatively higher proportion of middle-SES families in this particular sample. In general, the range of status characteristics was greatest among study families in Lee County, followed by Portland, with Trenton providing the most homogeneous sample. Larger proportions of parents and heads-of-households in Lee County reportedly were working (88% vs. 73% in Portland and 68% in Trenton). Although the occupational levels of employed mothers and fathers did not differ significantly for families in Lee County and Portland (*M*s = 5.1 and 4.7 for mothers, 4.3 and 4.7 for fathers, Census classifications for parents' occupations in Trenton (*M*s = 5.8 for mothers and fathers) were significantly lower in prestige value than those for families in either of the two other sites. Father absence was substantially higher in the urban sites (49% in Trenton and 43% in Portland vs. 22% in Lee County) and urban families apparently relied more on public-assistance income (36% and 23% vs. 7%).

Families in Lee County reportedly had lived in the same neighborhoods significantly longer than urban families (Ms = 12.2 years vs. 8.6 years in Trenton and 7.1 years in Portland); larger proportions of Lee County families owned their homes (77% vs. 63% and 43% in Portland and Trenton) and they were maintained in better repair. The highest percentage of homes that were old, in poor repair, and in noisy environments were in Trenton. Families in Trenton had moved significantly less often within the three preceding years (M = 0.3 times) than families in Lee County (M = 0.5 times) who, in turn, moved significantly fewer times than families in Portland (M = 0.7 times). Households in Lee County and Portland contained on the average equivalent numbers of residents, but households in both were significantly smaller than in Trenton (Ms = 5.8 and 5.4 vs. 6.3). Families in Lee County had taken study children to visit physicians and dentists less frequently than families in the urban sites. Whether such differences are due to better health of study children in Lee County, more affordable or accessible health-care facilities in the urban sites, or other factors is not known.

Some distributions of status/situational characteristics favored families in Portland. Mothers' educational levels, similar in Lee County and Trenton (Ms = 10.7 and 10.3 years), were significantly higher in Portland (M = 11.7 years). Fathers' mean educational levels were approximately the same in Lee County and Portland (Ms = 11.1 and 11.7 years) and significantly above those in Trenton (M = 10.1 years). Material resources available in the home to the family in general (e.g., household appliances) and to study children in particular (e.g., children's books, toys, games, and separate sleeping and dressing facilities) were highest in Portland but lowest in Trenton although differences among means were not significant. Further contrasts between status/situational characteristics of families living in the two urban sites consistently favored families in Portland. It should be noted that these differences in demographic indices are consistent with the disproportionate ethnic and socioeconomic distributions across sites discussed earlier.

These site differences in mothers' descriptions of family status/situational characteristics appeared to coincide with site differences obtained for several family process variables. For example, relative to families in the two other sites, mothers in Trenton reported a greater degree of dissatisfaction with their formal education and with both their and their husband's job, worse facilities and buildings in local schools, and greater interest in joining neighbors to improve community conditions. More Trenton mothers said they wanted to move and fewer would recommend that friends move into their neighborhood; a higher proportion of their children reportedly had no friends. By contrast, mothers in Lee County expressed the most favorable opinions about local school facilities and buildings, classroom overcrowding, and neighborhood conditions. Congruent with their higher educational level, mothers in Portland reported relatively greater involvement in advancing their own educations and in voting, and they were more aware of the availability of community resources (and reportedly had contacted organizations or individuals in the community more about educational, legal, and employment problems) and of the name of their child's teacher. Also, more Portland mothers described verbal responses to their child's misbehaviors (including rationales for punishments). Higher percentages of Portland mothers reported that the study child was already performing various skills and responsibilities, and indicated that s/he did not need assistance with his/her homework.

Other family processes, however, appeared to reflect less obvious associations with status/situational characteristics and to mirror specific extra-familial situational factors. Mothers in Trenton reported relatively high frequencies of newspaper reading and participation in national elections. In addition, these mothers expressed the most favorable attitudes about local teachers and teachers' concerns for their children and local problems. However, mothers in Trenton expressed the greatest discrepancies between aspired and expected educational attainments for study children, reported higher frequencies of helping with homework, and gave less individuated evaluations of their children. Similarly, mean ages at which children were expected to perform various household and personal responsibilities were higher for children in Trenton than in the other two sites. These differences, however, reflect observed differences in children's level of functioning across sites.

Except for a differential voting pattern, with more mothers in Trenton and Portland than in Lee County who reported voting in the 1972 national election (85% and 86% vs. 60%), the levels of mothers' participation in community and educational activities were comparable across sites.

Race differences. Differences between responses of mothers in black and white families appeared to reflect the confounding of race and socioeconomic standing in the sample rather than clear ethnicity differences. Educational and occupational levels of both parents were significantly higher in white families. White mothers had an average of 12.2 years of schooling and an average job classification of 3.9 vs. 10.3 years and 5.7 for black mothers; corresponding means for white fathers were 13.1 years and 3.4 vs. 9.7 years and 5.8 for black fathers. Eighty-five percent of employed black fathers had blue-collar jobs, 33% of which were classified as unskilled vs. 49% and 8%, respectively, for white fathers; 77% of employed black mothers had blue-collar jobs, 57% of which were classified as unskilled vs. 40% and

21%, respectively, for white mothers. Congruent with national trends revealing the particularly severe economic decline for black families, particularly those in poverty areas (National Urban League, 1976), among those fathers of known employment status, whether presently living in the home or not, 29% of black fathers vs. 9% of white fathers were unemployed. Also, consistent with recent Census statistics, the incidence of single-parent families was much higher among black study families (46% vs. 14%). Associated with the higher percentage of women as head-of-household and higher percentage of unemployed husbands in black study families, more black than white mothers were employed (82% vs. 69%), and a significantly higher percentage of black families had to rely on public assistance than did white families (25% vs. 6%).

Other family status/situational characteristics further help to sketch the relatively impoverished conditions for study children in black families. In comparison with white study families, on the average the number of people living in black households was significantly higher (_Ms_ = 6.1 vs. 5.2) and black households were more crowded (_Ms_ for rooms-to-people ratios were 1.1 vs. 1.3). Black study families had lived in the same neighborhoods significantly longer (_Ms_ = 10.7 years vs. 8.1 years), although there was no racial difference in the mean number of moves within the three preceding years, and home ownership was significantly less (57% vs. 81%). Material resources, including household conveniences and appliances, and children's possessions and separate dressing and storage facilities were significantly more abundant in white households. For example, the percentage of black study families having a car or telephone was 67% and 76% vs. 96% and 95% for white families. Also, study children in white families reportedly visited physicians and dentists significantly more often than did black study children. Twenty-one percent of black children vs. 5% of white children were reported to have not visited a doctor or received a medical examination in the past three years.

These impoverished status/situational conditions reported among black families appear to be reflected in a number of reported attitudinal and behavioral responses. For example, with less time and resources available, proportionally fewer black mothers attended social- or education-oriented group meetings or initiated meetings with their child's teacher. With larger families, fewer black mothers took study children along on visits to friends, public places of entertainment, or shopping. Reflecting differences in knowledge of resources and/or availability of resources, rather than respondent needs, contacts with organizations or individuals in the community concerning educational and legal problems were higher among white study families than black families (36% and 20% vs. 19% and 13%, respectively). However, probably as a consequence of the higher levels of unemployment among black study families, reported contacts about employment problems were slightly greater among black respondents than among white respondents (13% vs. 7%). Black mothers expressed somewhat more pessimistic attitudes, although it must be emphasized that such pessimism was not pervasive and more probably reflected actual circumstances than general dispositions. For example, the discrepancy between aspirations and expectations for their child's future education and job was greater for black mothers than for white mothers. Also, fewer black mothers would recommend their neighborhoods as places for friends to live. In some respects, however, mothers of black study children expressed significantly more positive responses, i.e., in statements that teachers really want to talk with parents about school, and in ratings that study children were above average in positively-valenced behaviors. To what extent such differences reflect the higher status white mothers' greater ease in the interview situation is, of course, unknown. In other respects there were no significant race differences in family processes, such as mothers' willingness to join neighbors to improve local schools or neighborhoods, involvement in advancing their formal educations, attitudes that local teachers do what they can to teach all children and that local school facilities and equipment are satisfactory, ratings of study children's maturity, individuation of some negatively-valenced child behaviors, and number of different categories mentioned in describing hypothetical good students. Thus, even though most black mothers in the present sample experienced relatively impoverished circumstances, they apparently fostered or sustained positive attitudes about local schools and teachers and participated in activities to help alleviate their impoverishment.

Several significant race differences in mothers' evaluations of their children are noteworthy. In descriptions of study children's strengths and weaknesses, black mothers mentioned obedience and cooperativeness, exclusively or in combination with other characteristics, more often than white mothers (46% vs. 27%). Opposite results occurred for mention of social and academic skills and personal qualities such as independence (7% vs. 21% each). Related to this, significantly more white mothers (32% vs. 9%) expressed the desirability of having their child choose whatever job s/he wanted. In addition, black study children were reported to have fewer hobbies, special interests, and friends, and more special problems than white study children. We do not know to what extent such expressions reflect race/SES differences in maternal attitudes, maternal behaviors, or child behaviors.

Sex differences. As would be expected, there were no significant differences between status/situational characteristics of families of male and female study children. In comparisons within and across races for male and female study children those family processes studied appeared least favorable for black males, especially compared to white females. However, these findings mostly reflect the race differences described earlier because mean levels of family variables for black males did not differ significantly from those for black females. Also, except for significantly higher educational aspirations for white males, there were no significant differences between reported attitudes and behaviors for mothers of male and female study children in white families.

Differential patterns of mother-child interactions according to these status categories also were not found. There were a few sex differences, however, on items concerning mothers' perceptions of children's school attitudes and motivations and on some of the child-maturity items. For example, more mothers of boys indicated that their child had had problems learning to read and adjusting to school in first grade, and that they enjoyed school less. More girls were reported to try harder to do well in school and to like academic subjects, whereas more boys were perceived to try harder to succeed in sports and games and to perform well in school athletic activities. Of course, the extent to which these responses reflect common sex stereotypes rather than actual behaviors is unknown. It should be noted, however, that of those children reportedly retained in a grade, 10% vs. 5% were boys, and more often due to cognitive or perceptual difficulties. More mothers of girls reported that their child could read without help at earlier ages, and girls reportedly had more books and used library books more frequently. In addition, more girls were considered persistent, mature, especially with respect to speaking and acting older, as well as more helpful with household chores such as caring for younger children. Where mothers indicated they were worried about their child's special problems, idiosyncratic characteristics and social problems were mentioned more with respect to girls while emotional and academic problems were more prevalent for boys. Rationales provided for their child not completing school also differed according to the child's sex: for girls, marriage was the predominant reason given (25% vs. 1%), whereas lack of motivation was most frequently cited for boys (34% vs. 19%). According to mothers' accounts, in 95% of the cases children played with special friends who were the same sex. No differential patterns of maternal behaviors or other maternal attitudes, however, were found among mothers of boys and girls.

Preschool attendance differences. As was noted in Chapter 2, of the 635 study children who attended Head Start, 88% were black and of the 280 who attended other programs only 38% were black. Thus, contrasts between families of study children who attended Head Start and other preschool programs are redundant with preceding racial/SES comparisons. However, a significantly smaller proportion of black than white study children reportedly did not attend a preschool program (16% of 793 vs. 41% of 419, respectively). Whether these differences reflect differential race/SES maternal attitudes toward educational or child-care aspects of center-based preschool programs or differential availability of alternatives given the higher percentage of black female heads-of-household is not clear. Mothers' descriptions of the benefits to themselves of study children's preschool experience, in either Head Start or other programs, most often mentioned personal freedom to work, relax, etc. (25% for "Head Start" mothers vs. 37% for "other preschool" mothers), however comparable percentages of responses mentioned benefits focused on the children (25% vs. 32%). Financial benefits and close relationships with center staff were more frequently cited by Head Start mothers (12% vs. 0% and 10% vs. 2%, respectively). For mother's responses concerning benefits of preschool experience for study children, the initial most frequent responses for "Head Start" mothers were in academic (36%) and social (30%) areas; the reverse emphasis was obtained among "other preschool" mothers: academic (11%), social (44%). These responses, of course, may reflect differential needs of the children on entry into preschool.

An attempt to untangle the confounded relationships of study children's preschool attendance with race/SES involved comparisons of black families in which study children attended Head Start (n = 559) with other black families in which study children had not attended any preschool program (n = 127). While these two groups were generally similar, the "no-preschool" families were of slightly higher socioeconomic status. Both parents had attended school longer and they reported a greater number of household possessions than did black Head Start families; however, such comparisons should be interpreted cautiously because of disproportional representation of these two groups of families in the three sites (e.g., 48% of the black Head Start families lived in Lee County, the home of only 6% of the black "no-preschool" group).

A few family process variables apparently reflecting group differences in parental educational level seemed to favor families in which study children did not attend preschool: more interactive-informative responses to study children's questions; more frequent newspaper reading; a greater proportion of mothers voting; higher educational aspirations and higher achievement press for study children; and more differentiation (i.e., discrete categories) used to describe study children's weaknesses and hypothetical good students and teachers. But although slightly more optimistic about making neighborhood improvements, they were less satisfied with their neighborhood, jobs, and education, had fewer friends and relatives nearby, and were less aware of the availability of community facilities, factors that in part may explain their not having enrolled their child in preschool. Although mothers in black Head Start families rated study children as above average significantly more often than mothers of study children with no preschool experience, Head Start children reportedly could do significantly fewer nonschool-related activities and responsibilities at the time of the interview than children with no preschool experience. Otherwise, these two groups were equivalent in those family processes assessed, including mothers' participation in extra-family activities and educational attitudes. In fact, there was a consistent trend for greater involvement/interest of Head Start mothers in educational activities (i.e., helping more with the study child's homework, visiting the child's classroom more often and attending more school meetings, expressing more favorable attitudes toward the study child's school and teachers, and having the child bring more library books home) and more favored parental control in the school. Given the previously found associations between higher SES and greater community participation and more favorable educational attitudes, these findings for the lower-SES Head Start group may reflect effects of Head Start participation.

Follow Through attendance. Of the 559 black children who had attended Head Start, 197 (19%) attended a Follow Through program in elementary school. Follow Through attendance was entered as a 0-1 variable in the correlation matrix of the Year 6 interview items. Thus, a significant positive correlation of this variable with an interview item also indicates a significantly higher mean value for the "Follow Through" group. The low correlation of this dummy variable with years of mother's education (r = .15) and head-of-household occupation (r = .10) suggests the absence of serious SES confounding, although the unavailability of Follow Through in Lee County leads to a confounding of the variable with site. Since provision of medical services is an integral part of the Follow Through program, items relating to whether or not the child had seen a doctor or dentist in the last year would be expected to be, and indeed were found to be, related to Follow Through participation (_rs_ with the dummy variable of .22 and .33 for visits to the doctor and dentist, respectively). Similarly, the Follow Through program emphasis on parental involvement was reflected in the correlation of the dummy variable with frequency of attendance at educational meetings (_r_ = .26) and the frequency of maternal visits to the school for a variety of special activities (_r_ = .33). In addition, mothers of Follow Through children were more likely to know the names of their children's teachers (_r_ = .17). Mothers' involvement in and knowledge of community affairs also appeared to be greater in the Follow Through sample, as exemplified in items reflecting knowledge about community facilities (_r_ = .25), participation in national elections (_r_ = .24), and interest in joining with neighbors to improve the community (_r_ = .28). Future analyses should examine these findings in greater detail, contrasting results for comparable children within site.

Summary

As indicated in the preceding sections, the Year 6 parent interview provided a considerable amount of information on a wide variety of topics. Some of the key findings are reviewed below.

The Year 6 study sample was a predominantly working-class group. Most fathers were employed in blue-collar jobs and parents on the average had had approximately eleven years of schooling. Fifty-five percent of the mothers were employed, more than half of whom had been employed for the three years the study child had been in school; 40% of the mothers reportedly had supplemented their educational background with additional training. Although families could not be classified as extremely impoverished, most were generally economically disadvantaged. In 36% of the families fathers were absent and 18% relied on public assistance for support. Although the majority of families in the sample reportedly owned their own homes, many were in poor repair and 11% of families resided in public housing. Nearly every home had a television, radio, and phonograph, but almost a quarter of the children in the study had to share a bed. Also indicative of the greater incidence of stress conditions to which study children were exposed, during the preceding three years at least 13% had been seriously injured or ill and 15% had not had a medical examination. In addition, in 16% of the households there was a family member with a serious chronic illness.

Responses to many of the items in the Year 6 interview suggested that even within a relatively narrow socioeconomic range there is considerable variability in family attitudes and behaviors. There was considerable range in the extent and apparent quality of mother-child interactions. In general, mothers engaged in a number of activities with their children; most mothers regularly helped the study child with homework assignments; two-thirds of the mothers read stories to the study child; most mothers attended church with their children and took the study child along when they went on shopping trips or to visit friends or relatives. Mothers differed more in their expectations and evaluations of their children, and in their control strategies and disciplinary techniques.

In some respects, interest in community activities was moderately high; over 80% of the sample reportedly read newspapers and attended church, and 63% of the mothers reportedly voted in the national election of 1972. On the other hand, with the exception of church, participation in formal groups was limited; a sizable minority of families never visited friends or relatives and more than a third of the sample reportedly never went outside of the home for entertainment.

Most mothers said that they had sufficient opportunities to learn about their child's school experiences. Although participation in school-related activities was generally low, over two-thirds of the mothers reported they had attended at least one school conference about the study child's school progress and nearly half of the mothers reportedly had attended at least one PTA meeting during the school year.

Although there was a substantial minority of mothers who reported some dissatisfaction with their neighborhoods, most mothers seemed satisfied with the schools and teachers in their communities. Over three-quarters of the mothers thought teachers 1) do as much as they can to teach all children, 2) do a good job of teaching, and 3) want to have discussions with parents about school-related matters. Teachers were usually not blamed for children's poor school achievement. On the negative side, over half of the mothers indicated at least some teachers did not understand problems faced by local residents, and 60% of the mothers thought at least some local classrooms were overcrowded. More than half of the mothers hoped the study child would graduate from college but only a quarter of the mothers actually expected this achievement; about a third of the mothers expected the study child to complete at least two years of college.

When responses were examined separately by site, race, and the child's sex and preschool experience, several salient differences emerged. The greatest contrast among families in the three study sites was between those in Lee County and those in the two urban sites. On the average, living conditions in Lee County were generally better and more stable, while study families living in Trenton appeared to be the most impoverished. Mean parental educational and occupational levels, proportion of home owners, and number of household possessions were lower, and unemployment and father absence higher, in Trenton than in the two other sites. The highest mean occupational levels and lowest incidence of unemployment and single-parent households occurred for families in Lee County; mean educational levels were highest among parents in Portland. However, it must be noted that the relatively large number of middle-SES white families in Lee County tends to distort these mean level comparisons; the range of status characteristics was greatest in Lee County and the rural black families there were at least as impoverished as the black families in Trenton.

Black families in the sample generally lived in more impoverished and crowded conditions with fewer physical and psychological resources available to study children than white families. Significantly higher levels of father unemployment and single-parent households indicated the particularly negative economic impact on black families. Most racial differences in maternal attitudes and behaviors obtained (e.g., greater dissatisfaction with one's neighborhood, greater discrepancy between desired and expected educational and occupational attainment for their child, and less frequent going out among black families) appeared to reflect the confounding of race with socioeconomic status rather than ethnicity *per se*. It is unclear, however, whether the greater emphasis by black mothers on the child's obedience reflects ethnic or socioeconomic differences in child-rearing values.

Differences obtained among families who did and did not enroll the study child in Head Start or another preschool program reflected the disproportions in race/SES across these categories. The lack of difference obtained in educational attitudes and involvement for the lower status Head Start group suggested, however, the favorable impact of Head Start on the parents' involvement in their child's schooling. A subanalysis comparing black Head Start families whose child was and was not enrolled in the Follow Through program indicated the mother's participation in her child's schooling was further enhanced by this program. Follow Through attendance also was associated with the mother's greater participation in community activities and the child's receipt of more medical services. These findings suggest the positive impact of a continued comprehensive program in the schools.

Responses to most interview items were highly similar for mothers of boys and mothers of girls. Mothers' reports of their child's interests and abilities, however, indicated that girls generally were perceived as more cooperative, mature, academic oriented, and successful in their adaptation to the school setting.

Interrelationships Among Family Variables, Year 6

The following section presents relationships within and among family status, situational, and process variables assessed in Year 6. Implications of the relationships of status and situational characteristics to concurrent indices of family processes are broad and include suggestions of how conditions of impoverishment in families are or are not associated with processes that have developmental impacts on children. Furthermore, these results illustrate the variety of family processes that may or may not be related to conventional indices of family status; a variety that may be either misrepresented or overlooked when families are described by status indicators alone. Values of rs are reported as significant only when they equal or exceed the .01 probability level, although with the large sample size the magnitude of the correlations should be of more interest than mere statistical significance.

Relationships Among Status and Situational Variables

Interrelationships among status and situational characteristics are presented in Table 6.[4] Variables are listed according to their primary referent, i.e., parents, households, or study children. As can be seen, although in general status and situational variables showed a moderately high interrelationship, with a consistent trend for correlations to be higher with parental education than with occupational status, these indices are obviously not interchangeable. It should be noted, moreover, that father absence was generally not associated with the socioeconomic status variables and, except for indices of material resources, showed little or no association with other situational variables. Also, although statistically significant, the relationships between both number of moves and years the family had lived in the town with other situational and status variables were low, indicating the many both positive and negative factors accounting for residential mobility.

Relationships Between Status/Situational and Process Variables

Given the relatively high degree of relationship among the various status and situational variables except for the two exceptions noted, relationships of only seven representative status and situational characteristics with process variables are described in order to simplify the presentation. The selected status and situational characteristics are parents' education, head-of-household occupation, number of household appliances and conveniences, crowding, availability of separate sleeping

---

[4] In the Census scale for occupational status, low numbers reflect high status. To facilitate interpretation of relationships with the occupational level score, for all correlations reported in the text signs have been changed to reflect this reversal.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Status and Situational Characteristics of Families in Year 6

	n	*M*	*SD*	Head of Household occupation	Mother's education	Father's education	Father absence	Adult availability	Crowding index	Number of moves	Years lived in same neighborhood	Years lived in same town	Visits to MD	Visits to DDS	Child seriously ill	# Child's possessions	# Child's separate facilities	# Child's books	# Household conveniences
Mother's occupation (employed only)	660	6.1	2.5	60	60	50	06	18	33	00	-11	-16	18	26	13	33	25	39	29
Head-of-household occupation (including unemployed)	1179	6.8	2.9		48	57	-37	-33	24	-07	-04	-17	18	23	13	37	27	36	41
Mother's education (years)	1203	11.0	2.8			66	-14	21	33	-03	-13	-22	25	35	07	43	35	39	41
Father's education (years)	1012	11.1	3.9				09	21	39	00	-17	-25	26	34	08	48	36	45	41
Father absence	1203	0.35	0.5					-43	06	14	-02	10	-09	-02	-07	-22	-13	-15	-36
Adult availability $\left[\frac{\#\text{children}}{\#\text{adults}}\right.$	1212	2.25	1.5						35	10	-06	-04	16	14	-07	34	38	-25	30
Crowding index $\left[\frac{\#\text{ rooms}}{\#\text{ people}}\right.$	1207	1.18	0.6							02	-11	-10	18	24	07	33	41	26	22
Number of moves in 3 years	1183	0.49	0.8								-24	-12	-02	-05	08	-11	-02	-08	-16
Years lived in same neighborhood	1204	9.8	10.7									57	-18	-19	-09	-03	-07	-04	-10
Years lived in same town	1196	20.0	13.0										-17	-15	-10	-15	-13	-14	-16
Visits to MD (frequency)	1210	3.6	3.4											28	33	26	22	24	25
Visits to DDS (frequency)	1169	2.0	1.2												06	34	27	25	29
Child seriously ill in past 3 years	1206	0.22	0.4													-08	-08	-08	-04
# Child's possessions	1212	6.0	2.4														43	28	52
# Child's separate facilities	1212	4.4	1.7															44	38
# Child's books	1149	18.1	22.4																30
# Household conveniences	1212	6.7	1.6																

Note. Decimal points omitted from all correlations; differences in *n*s reflect differential number of indeterminate responses to particular items.

and storage facilities for study children, and number of child possessions (i.e., toys, games, etc.). These indices represent those characteristics within each of the three referent clusters that had the highest magnitudes of relationships with other status and situational characteristics (see Table 6).

Relationships of status and situational characteristics with variables representing relatively direct influences of the mother on her child were typically of low magnitude and systematic across all status and situational characteristics. For example, the seven status and situational characteristics were all related positively to the mother's use of informative-interactive techniques for answering the study child's questions and taking the child with her on excursions outside the home (rs generally in mid .20's). Similarly related was the mother's report that the study child had a library card (rs ranged from .21 for separate sleepping/storage facilities to .35 for mother's education). There were no significant status and situational relationships with frequency of the mother's helping the study child with homework assignments or reading stories to him/her, or with the mother's use of physical or verbal strategies in response to the child's misbehaviors (a single exception being a negative correlation between mother's education and use of physical punishment, $r = -.20$). Thus it seems that much of the variability in the way mothers relate to their children is independent of the status level of the family; at best, less than 13% of the variance in any of these process variables can be explained by any one of the status or situational variables.

Low positive correlations also were found between the status/situational variables and mothers' personal activities (e.g., reading newspapers and magazines, taking trips outside the home, participating in civic and educational groups, voting). Although most correlations were in the teens to mid .20's, relationships of parental educational levels to magazine reading and membership in groups reached the mid .30's.

Mothers' expressed satisfaction with their neighborhoods and their formal education were related positively to the number of years they and their husbands had attended school and to the head-of-household's occupation level, although again relationships were relatively weak (rs ranged from .18 to .35 for mother's education and mother's educational satisfaction). Mothers' opinions of their efficacy in overcoming their dissatisfactions by improving conditions in neighborhoods, local schools, or their own educational background were generally unrelated to most status/situational characteristics. However, these opinions were related positively to their educational level and to the number of children's possessions in their homes (rs in the teens). Thus, in the current sample, there was only a slight indication that lower status families are relatively more dissatisfied or perceive themselves as less powerful.

Relationships between status/situational characteristics and mothers' aspirations and expectations for study children's educational attainment were quite high relative to the correlations with other attitudinal and behavioral variables. Correlations were strongest for expected education (rs ranged from .28 for separate sleeping/storage facilities to .53 for mother's education); relationships were diminshed somewhat for aspired education which varied less in this sample (rs ranged from .27 to .42). The level of formal schooling attained by the parents appears to be an important correlate of the anticipated achievement level of the child.

Similarly, mothers' expectations of ages at which study children should be able to perform various skills and responsibilities, and perform them well, were related inversely to status/situational characteristics. That is, mothers of lower status and in more negative situational circumstances expected study children to perform these activities at relatively older ages. Values of rs for these relationships ranged from -.17 to -.28. By contrast, mothers' evaluations of study children's maturity (e.g., study children speak better, act older than age peers) and mothers' positive or negative individuation of study children were not related to status and situational characteristics. These findings suggest greater group (i.e., SES) differences in independence training or in the meaning/value of these activities, but greater individual differences in the mother's acceptance/evaluation of her child's present functioning.

Family status/situational characteristics were not related to maternal attitudes concerning whether teachers try to teach all children or understand local problems. Mothers' statements that local classrooms were overcrowded, however, were slightly negatively related to status/situational characteristics (rs ranged from -.18 to -.19). In addition, parents' educational levels and head-of-household's occupation status were related negatively to the mother's belief that most teachers really want to talk with parents about school (rs ranged from -.16 to -.20). In general, then, there was a slight tendency for lower status mothers to evaluate their school system more negatively (and/or for more adverse school conditions to be present in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods), but this general tendency was not strong and there were many exceptions.

Relationships Among Process Variables

In general, the clusters of family process variables had low to moderate association among themselves. Two specific exceptions were relationships between the two groups of variables representing mothers' attitudes about teachers/schools and mothers' evaluations of study children. In most cases variables in each of these groups were interrelated positively, which may be due in part to a more general maternal disposition (e.g., individuation, optimism, pessimism, etc.) reflected in attitudes toward others. There were few significant relationships of variables from either group, however, with other groups of process variables. An exception was the finding that the mother's statement that many community classrooms were overcrowded was related negatively to a number of different process variables including feelings of efficacy about personally improving schools, membership in education-related groups, frequency of reading newspapers and magazines, and educational aspirations and expectations for the study child (rs ranged from -.16 to -.19), reflecting a more pervasive impoverishment of physical and psychological resources. To the extent that such overcrowding was an objective statement of actual conditions, it represents another example of a positive although low association of situational and process variables and suggests that the more impoverished families in the sample experienced more impoverished educational conditions for their children.

Positive correlations were generally obtained across groups representing: mothers' descriptions of their interactions with study children; mothers' exposure to the environment outside the home both directly and indirectly (e.g., through reading newspapers); mothers' reported frequencies of participation in voting, community activities, and education-related activities; mothers' expectations for study children's achievement; and measures of mothers' awareness of resources in the community and general environment (*r*s ranged from .17 to .37). Some variables within these groups, however, were not related to other family processes: (a) frequency of the mother's reported helping the study child with homework assignments or reading to him/her, and use of physical punishment in response to the child's misbehaviors; (b) reported extent of the study child's daily television viewing; (c) frequency of the mother's visits to friends' homes (with or without the study child accompanying); and (d) number of different categories the mother mentioned in her descriptions of the study child's weaknesses and hypothetical good students.

The findings generally supported the commonly reported correlation between alienation and feelings of powerlessness. The group of items representing the mother's feelings of efficacy in overcoming dissatisfactions with community and personal conditions was related positively to the mother's reported frequency of participation in voting, and in community and education-related activities; her expectations for the study child's achievement; and measures of the mother's knowledge of her general environment (*r*s ranged from .16 to .27). However, within this group of items assessing the mother's feelings of efficacy, significant correlations were not obtained with the mother's willingness to recommend neighborhoods to friends, satisfaction with her past schooling, and feeling of efficacy in disagreements with school principals, reflecting the specificity in orientations arising from differences in individuals' present and past experiences.

Group Differences

The preceding interrelationships within and among status and situational characteristics and process variables were examined separately for families in each racial group, for black families of study children who attended either Head Start or no preschool program, and for families of male and female study children within each race. These breakdowns indicate the degree of association of relationships described above with the major classifications of study families. Differences described below for groups of families within these classifications refer to differences between correlation coefficients at $p \leq .01$.

Race. Consistent with other research (Stricker, 1976) and previous study findings (Shipman, 1972a), a significantly smaller correlation was obtained between mother's and father's educational and occupational levels for black families than for white families (rs = .47 and .39 vs. .67 and .71, respectively). For relationships of status and situational characteristics with process variables, almost all of the significant racial differences obtained involved parents' educational levels and head-of-household occupational classification. Consistent with the greater range for level of father's education and head-of-household occupation in white families, these variables accounted for significantly more variance among relationships with other family variables in white families than in black families. Again, occupational status appeared to have a different meaning for white and black families.

Patterns of correlations among process variables were consistent across racial groups, and, with the exception of those relationships involving the mother's expectation for her child's educational attainment, generally of slightly higher magnitude among black families. As noted earlier, the range of expected educational attainment was considerably smaller in the black sample.

Head Start attendance. Patterns of correlations generally did not differ systematically for families of black study children who did and did not attend

Head Start, although there was a slight tendency for correlations to be higher among the families whose children attended Head Start. The extent to which this reflects greater consistency in responding and/or the influence of other variables on which these groups differ, however, is unknown.

Sex. There were no consistent significant differences among relationships of family variables according to the sex of study children, nor were there any discernible patterns that although not significant reflected such differences.

Summary

In general, correlations among status and situational variables were relatively high, with a consistent trend for correlations to be higher with parents' educational level than with occupational status. Although positive correlations were obtained across the various *a priori* groups of process variables, particularly those relating alienation and feelings of powerlessness, the magnitudes were generally low, indicating the diversity in attitudes and behaviors assessed. The findings did indicate, however, that for the mothers in this sample, feelings of optimism and efficacy were associated with greater knowledge and use of community resources, greater participation in community and school activities, and less reliance on status appeals for controlling their children.

Those relationships obtained between status and situational variables with family process variables provide clues as to how conditions of impoverishment in families may be associated with parental attitudes and behaviors that have potential developmental impact on children. Nevertheless, the general low magnitude of these correlations suggests that much of the variation in family attitudes and behaviors is independent of variation in family status; among status variables, however, the more numerous and consistent associations obtained with parental educational level across groups suggest its greater value as a meaningful composite of the more fundamental process variables. The mother's expectation for her child's educational attainment had the highest correlation with the family status variables, with the extent of the parents' own schooling accounting for about 25% of the variance in the expected achievement level estimates. By contrast, many family process variables were unrelated to status-situational characteristics and thus described family functions which, if they occurred, were more independent of family status. Examples of such variables were: frequency of mother's reading to the study child and helping with his or her homework, maternal attitudes about local schools and teachers and feelings of efficacy in discussing problems with local school principals, frequency with which mothers visited friends and relatives, attended church, and initiated meetings at school with the study child's teachers, and the mother's use of verbal explanations in responding to her child's misbehaviors. There was only a slight tendency for lower status families in the present sample to perceive themselves as less powerful or more dissatisfied. It also should be noted that for this sample of families, father absence and residential mobility were generally unrelated to other status-situational characteristics or family process variables.

Thus, patterns of correlation within and among status, situational, and process variables indicated that meaningful clusters of items could be described. However, the level of correlation also indicated that indices were not interchangeable. For example, different socioeconomic indexes showed low to moderate correlation. Moreover, differences in strengths of correlations for black and white families for these indexes, particularly occupational status, suggested the differential meaning such indexes may have for these groups. Furthermore, although standard SES indexes reflect differences in resources reported available in the home, in general they were marginally related or unrelated to the various maternal attitudes and behaviors assessed indicating that this sample, although predominantly low-income, is not a homogeneous group and that the notion of a homogeneous "culture of poverty" is a myth.

Chapter 7

STABILITY AND CHANGE IN FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

In this chapter we describe the extent to which selected family characteristics had remained stable for those families seen in both Year 1 and Year 6. These comparisons involved more than 80 items on each of the two interviews for 863 families in Lee County, Portland, and Trenton. For comparability some items were rescored so that they may appear in different formats for these analyses. Stability of sample characteristics is defined as equivalent mean levels of responses across years; change refers to unequal mean responses where the difference between means is significant at $\underline{p} \leq .01$. Longitudinal stability coefficients also were computed to determine the extent of individual change. Status/situational characteristics and process variables are described separately for the total longitudinal sample followed by summaries of differences according to site, and within site by sex within race and by category of study children's preschool experience. To provide a broader context for the understanding of these findings, those relationships obtained between family variables unique to each data collection period are presented also.

Status and Situational Characteristics

Means, standard deviations, and stability coefficients of status and situational characteristics presented in Table 7 indicate a fairly high degree of stability for these variables over the five years of the study. As expected, parents' levels of formal education were stable and represent a reliability check across years; the slight increase in mother's education may reflect participation in adult education programs. For the 267 mothers employed in both years and for 772 employed heads-of-households, there was no change in mean occupational levels. There was a net longitudinal decrease of 7% in the number of employed heads-of-household ($\underline{n}$ = 764). Similarly, employment of

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and Stability Coefficients for Selected Status and Situational Variables in Years 1 and 6

	Year 1		Year 6			
	M	SD	M	SD	n	r
Mother's education	10.88	2.61	10.97	2.79	847	.88
Father's education	11.16	3.92	11.25	4.06	587	.92
Mother employed	.38	.46	.56[a]	.49	803	.49
Father employed	.96	.19	.91[a]	.29	540	.31
Head-of-household occupation	5.88	3.03	5.95	3.22	772	.63
Mother's occupation (employed only)	5.34	2.39	5.20	2.35	267	.64
Rooms per person	1.04	0.48	1.16[a]	0.56	844	.52
Number of moves in past three years	0.93	1.17	0.43[a]	0.78	807	.26
Rated noise levels	2.21	0.98	2.63[a]	0.69	798	.16
Number of selected household possessions	6.09	1.71	6.67[a]	1.54	855	.56
Number of child's separate facilities	3.83	1.64	4.38[a]	1.65	855	.44
Father absence	.29	.45	.36[a]	.48	847	.56

Note. Differences in *ns* reflect differential numbers of indeterminate responses to particular items.

[a] Year 6 mean significantly different from Year 1 mean.

fathers (*n* = 540) decreased longitudinally by 5%. By contrast, 18% more mothers were employed in Year 6 than in Year 1 (*n* = 803). To indicate the extent of individual differences in occupational mobility across years Table 8 shows the (average) proportion of longitudinal households in which occupational status changed or remained stable for those employed in both years. In addition, proportions of persons who became employed or unemployed are presented.

Table 8

Change in Occupation Level from Year 1 to Year 6

	n	Upward	Downward	No Change	Became Employed	Became Unemployed
HOH	764	.14	.21	.46	.06	.13
Father	540	.17	.24	.50	.02	.07
Mother	803	.05	.06	.55	.24	.11

The average size of study families increased significantly from 5.3 to 5.9 persons. There was a corresponding decrease in adult availability (adult/child ratio) reflecting in part increased family size but also an increase in absence of a father figure in the home. Since these longitudinal families were those that remained in the sample, it was not surprising that families reported significantly fewer moves in the three years preceding Year 6 than in Year 1. Table 7 otherwise reflects small but significant increases in families' material well-being, with more child and family possessions noted and less crowding (i.e., a higher rooms-to-people ratio). Home ownership had increased during this period from 42% to 59% of study families. Also, interviewers' ratings of noise levels (on a scale from a lot of distracting noise to no noise) indicated homes were less noisy in Year 6 than in Year 1, which would be consistent with the fact that homes were less crowded and children outside the home more. Since different interviewers may have had different subjective scales, these data, however, are only suggestive.

For those stable group status and situational characteristics described above, stability coefficients were positive and relatively high, ranging from

.63 for head-of-household occupation to .92 for father's education (see Table 7). However, for those characteristics indicating mean level changes, the moderate degree of correlation obtained across years suggested that families were not uniform or consistent in the direction or degree of change.

Family Process Variables

Table 9 presents means, standard deviations, and correlations across years for selected interview items representing various family processes. Those items describing parent-child interaction are presented first. As would be expected, mothers reported spending less time together with study children in Year 6 than they had in Year 1 (29% vs. 58% spent 8 hours or more per day). There was no change in the typical kind of household activities mothers were engaged in when with their children: most mothers reported that they were involved with housework and preparing meals. Responses to other interview items probing specific kinds of mother-child interactions did demonstrate change, especially for activities on which mothers had to assist younger children but which the child could do by him/herself as he/she grew more mature. For example, mothers reported more informative-interactive responses to study children's difficult questions in Year 6 than in Year 1. The typical response for mothers in Year 1 was answering as best they could, whereas in Year 6 mothers typically sent study children to another source of information. Fewer mothers ignored (1% vs. 11%) or deflected (10% vs. 26%) such questions. Given the development of reading skills by most study children by third grade, it was not surprising that frequencies of mothers' and other household members' reading to study children decreased significantly from Year 1 to Year 6. In Year 1, mothers reportedly were reading to study children once-a-week on the average, but in Year 6, the average frequency was less than once-a-week. A similar significant decrease

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for Selected Process Variables in Years 1 and 6

	Year 1		Year 6			
	M	SD	M	SD	n	r
I						
Mother's response to child's question	4.38	1.62	4.61[a]	1.83	795	.26
Mother reads to child (frequency)	2.10	1.38	1.27[a]	1.21	831	.23
Others read to child (frequency)	2.24	1.44	1.26[a]	1.36	831	.23
Mother's knowledge of child's favorite story (0-1)	0.67	0.47	0.68	0.46	844	.12
Physical vs. verbal punishment	0.16	0.37	0.49[a]	0.50	673	.08
II						
Number of places child accompanies mother	5.81	2.48	4.87[a]	2.60	855	.40
Mother visits relatives (frequency)	6.82	4.99	5.56[a]	4.94	855	.47
Mother visits friends (frequency)	6.66	4.87	4.81[a]	4.61	855	.21
Mother goes to entertainments (frequency)	3.69	3.65	2.63[a]	3.24	855	.27
Mother attends church (frequency)	2.55	1.57	2.46	1.90	843	.52
III						
Mother voted in last national election (0-1)	0.53	0.50	0.66[a]	0.47	853	.47
Number of group memberships	1.16	1.41	1.08	1.40	855	.47
Number of group offices held	0.23	0.52	0.27	0.58	855	.34
IV						
Mother wants to move (0-1)	0.39	0.49	0.39	0.49	831	.20
Recommend neighborhood to friend (0-1)	0.52	0.50	0.58[a]	0.49	782	.30
Mother knows someone having success in neighborhood improvements (0-1)	0.34	0.47	0.36	0.48	648	.12
Mother believes she can improve school (0-1)	0.53	0.50	0.67[a]	0.47	656	.20
Mother believes she can disagree effectively with principal (0-1)	0.69	0.46	0.92[a]	0.28	808	.09
Mother satisfied with her education (0-1)	0.61	0.49	0.61	0.49	833	.24
Years of mother's self-improvement classes	0.37	0.48	0.65[a]	1.03	830	.36
Father's additional education	0.35	0.48	0.66[a]	1.23	536	.39
V						
Educational aspirations for child	14.24	2.36	14.61[a]	2.26	849	.42
Educational expectations for child	12.70	2.25	13.05[a]	2.22	727	.58
VI						
Sum of mother's positive attitudes regarding schools	3.56	1.52	4.69[a]	1.00	855	.12
Desirability of parental control of schools (1-3)	1.78	0.92	1.69[a]	0.85	665	.36
OK to keep child out of school occasionally	0.79	0.41	0.77	0.42	834	.27
Most children have to be made to learn	0.70	0.89	0.56[a]	0.88	832	.28
VII						
How child is doing in school	3.28	1.99	3.67[a]	1.05	839	.10
Child's adjustment to first grade	2.40	0.65	2.47[a]	0.71	804	.14
Individuation ratings	2.59	1.19	1.80[a]	1.26	863	.27
Maturity ratings--positive behaviors	2.53	1.20	1.80[a]	1.26	863	.28
Maturity ratings--negative behaviors	1.38	1.18	1.12[a]	1.12	863	.27
VIII						
# diverse aspects of "good" students	1.65	0.81	1.59	0.75	855	.13
# diverse aspects of "good" teachers	1.33	0.74	1.27	0.64	855	.14
# child's different strong areas	1.62	0.80	1.55	0.79	855	.12
# child's different weak areas	0.83	0.64	0.94[a]	0.61	855	.13
Community resources "not available"	41.96	26.98	14.76[a]	18.54	855	.44
Community resources "don't know"	1.49	2.07	0.70	1.10	855	.13

[a] Year 6 mean significantly different from Year 1 mean.

occurred for frequency of other household members' reading to study children. Despite such decreases, the percent of mothers knowing the study child's favorite stories or books remained stable.

Another aspect of mother-child interaction concerned mothers' reported disciplinary techniques. The items were not completely parallel in Years 1 and 6; in Year 1, mothers described their responses to study children's serious and minor misbehaviors, while in Year 6 mothers described reactions to study children's behavior that had angered or annoyed them. In Year 1, mothers' usual responses to serious misbehaviors reportedly involved mild-to-severe physical punishments while the mean response to minor misbehaviors was strong verbal reprimands and scolding. Contrastingly, in Year 6, mothers reportedly used less physical punishment, and disciplinary behaviors most frequently involved revocation of priviledges such as watching TV. In addition, mothers in Year 6 reportedly gave more explanations of why study children's misbehavior was improper than in Year 1. Again, these changes may reflect the mothers' perception of the differential effectiveness of certain behaviors according to their children's developmental level.

Several comparisons of interview items concerned mothers' activities that have implications for their indirect support of study children's cognitive, personal, and social development. For example, mothers reportedly read newspapers daily, on the average, in both Year 1 and Year 6: likewise, equal numbers of mothers reported in both years that they read magazines. The frequencies of mothers' excursions outside the home to visit relatives, friends, and places of entertainment were significantly lower in Year 6 than in Year 1. Similarly, the total number of excursions in which study children accompanied mothers decreased significantly in Year 6, but this decline is attributable in part to the children's attendance at school and their increased extra-family contacts as well as to reduced maternal availability resulting from increased employment and family size. There were no significant differences in mothers' reported frequency of attendance at church (approximately an average of once every two weeks).

Slightly over half the mothers reported that they had voted in the 1968 national election, and significantly more (66%) reported having voted in 1972. However, mothers were generally not active in community organizations as indicated by number of group memberships and offices held (on the average mothers belonged to 1.2 groups in Year 1, 1.1 groups in Year 6). For those mothers who did belong to groups, frequency of attending declined, due in part perhaps to less available free time as a consequence of working. Approximately equal proportions of mothers in both years had contacted local people or organizations to get advice or help with educational, legal, health, or employment problems.

For this sample of mothers the percentage who expressed a desire to move was the same in Year 6 as it had been in Year 1 (approximately 40%). Significantly more mothers in Year 6, though, said they would recommend their neighborhoods as places of residence for their friends (58% in Year 6 vs. 52% in Year 1). However, mothers' opinions about their efficacy in joint efforts with their neighbors to improve their neighborhoods remained negative on the average, i.e., mothers indicated that some change was desired but they felt uncertain that they could join with neighbors and succeed in making the changes.

Mean levels of mothers' expressed satisfaction with their own formal schooling was stable longitudinally; mothers were neither very satisfied nor very dissatisfied with their education. However, as noted earlier, both mothers and fathers had participated in significantly more self-educational or advancement programs such as adult education evening classes or vocational training courses in Year 6 than in Year 1.

Mothers' aspirations and expectations for study children's educational attainment were significantly higher in Year 6 than in Year 1. We do not know if such parallel increases for aspirations and expectations are some function of study children or a more general optimism. Mothers were asked also in both years to state the age when the study child would be able to fix breakfast or dinner alone, do regular household chores, settle arguments with older siblings, read books without assistance, take part in adult conversations and interests, and earn spending money. The large differences obtained for these maternal expectancies suggest the differential meaning of these behaviors to mothers when their children are different ages.

In Year 6, although within each site study children attended many different schools, mothers' attitudes toward teachers and schools were significantly more positive. Fewer thought that teachers did not understand local issues and fewer rated children's teachers as inferior. Fewer mothers in Year 6 thought that classes were overcrowded or that local school facilities were inferior. More mothers also felt they could resolve disagreements with school principals than in Year 1 and fewer said they could do nothing about such differences. Also, in Year 6, mothers expressed significantly less favorable attitudes about effects of parental control in schools than in Year 1. There was a similar decrease in the number of mothers who felt parents were to blame if children did not work hard or do well in school work. Responses to these latter two items may reflect greater belief that acquisition of academic skills is the school's responsibility. Of course, the extent to which these findings reflect differences in the mothers or in the schools is unknown.

Equivalent and large percentages of mothers indicated in both years that parents should not keep study children at home during the school term. Now that study children were older and developing basic academic skills significantly fewer mothers in Year 6 indicated that they felt most children must be forced to learn in school. There also were interesting shifts to greater emphasis on personal-social characteristics in mothers' descriptions of "good students" and "good teachers." For good students, more respondents in Year 6 mentioned effort in studies, whereas in Year 1 good grades was cited more often. When describing good teachers, mothers in Year 6 stressed personal warmth more than they had in Year 1. More emphasis also was placed on professional training.

Mothers' predictions of their study child's future cognitive, personal, and social behaviors in Year 1 were compared with subsequent perceptions of the child's behaviors in grade school. For example, before preschool enrollment, study children generally were expected to do somewhat better than average, and, according to mothers' perceptions of the study child in Year 6, on the average they did. Similarly, there was no significant mean difference between mothers' expectations of the study child's success in adjusting to elementary school and mothers' subsequent perceptions of their child's actual adjustment.

In Year 6 mothers generally showed less individuation of the study child, i.e., they perceived their child as more nearly average on both positive and negative characteristics. Thus, by the time study children had advanced to third grade, mothers were less likely to describe them as happier, acting older, easier to get along with, and asking more questions than most children the same age. They also were less likely to characterize their children by negative descriptions such as crying more, having more temper tantrums, acting younger, tending to stay alone, and being more afraid. Given the parents' increased experience, including media exposure to facts of child development, these differences may reflect greater knowledge of the range of behaviors commonly associated with any age group.

Several interview variables may be considered indirect indicators of the mother's cognitive breadth and differentiation of her environment. The number of different categories mothers mentioned in open-ended descriptions of hypothetical good students and teachers were not significantly different across years; nor was there a significant change in mean number of categories used to describe study children's strong points. Interestingly, however, mothers mentioned more categories describing study children's weaknesses in Year 6 than in Year 1. Their greater familiarity with the study and being interviewed perhaps reduced any inhibition or defensiveness in discussing problem areas. As noted earlier, families had changed residences less frequently in the three years preceding Year 6 so that it is not surprising that mothers had significantly greater knowledge of the availability of fourteen community resources including museums, theaters, day-care centers, and clinics.

For all of the family processes described above, correlation coefficients were examined for indications of the degree to which stable or changing relationships were consistent in direction and magnitude among study families (see Table 9). Longitudinal increases or decreases for these variables usually were accompanied by low-to-moderate positive correlations. Principal exceptions included disciplinary techniques, attitudes about schools and teachers, and descriptions of study children's weaknesses. For variables with stable group means, correlations also were positive and generally of low-to-moderate magnitude. For several variables, however, the correlations were not significantly different from zero, suggesting differential intercorrelations with other family and child variables. These included: (a) knowledge of the study child's favorite books or stories; (b) contacting of community agencies for help with legal, health, educational, or occupational matters; (c) belief in the efficacy of joint efforts with neighbors to improve local community problems; (d) feeling that parents are to blame when children do not succeed in school work; and (e) the number of different characteristics used to describe the child's strengths and good students and teachers.

Group Differences

Site. Except for the deviations noted below, the patterns of stability and change for status/situational characteristics and process variables within each of the three sites were equivalent to those described above for the entire longitudinal sample. Exceptional patterns for status/situational variables within sites pertained to parents' employment status and to the material well-being of household environments, with families in Trenton diverging most from the overall pattern by showing the least improvement in economic conditions.

The previously reported longitudinal decreases in number of employed heads-of-household and fathers in the total interview sample were associated mostly with families in the urban sites and not with families in Lee County. For example, in Trenton and Portland there were 14% and 11% decreases, respectively, in number of employed heads-of-household and a 9% decrease in both sites in the number of employed fathers; corresponding decreases in Lee County were 4% and 2%, respectively. However, the previously noted increase in the number of working mothers was virtually uniform across the three sites, although study mothers in Trenton generally were less mobile with respect to occupational advancement. The relative stability of mothers' occupational status in Trenton was indicated both for the group and individually by: (a) significant increases (from equivalent initial levels across sites) in mean occupational levels for employed mothers in Lee County and Portland only; and (b) significantly higher cross-year correlations for the same variable in Trenton (r = .81), compared to Lee County (r = .66) or Portland (r = .55).

Concerning differences among sites in the physical resources available in the home, separate facilities for study children increased significantly for households in Lee County and Portland but remained unchanged for families in Trenton where the initial level of such possessions was intermediate between the two other sites. Correlations across years indicated that the greatest consistency associated with these longitudinal comparisons occurred among households in Lee County (r = .58 vs .26 in Trenton and .32 in Portland). The previously reported longitudinal increase in the ratio of rooms-to-people for the total sample was evident only among families in Lee County; the cross-year correlation was .69 compared to .38 in Trenton and .39 in Portland. Initial levels for this variable were equivalent across the three sites.

Sites did not differ consistently or systematically with respect to longitudinal stability and change of family process variables. The percent of mothers knowing the study child's favorite stories decreased significantly across years in Trenton (from an initial level of 75%) but increased significantly in Portland (from 58% in Year 1). This variable was stable for mothers in Lee County. Cross-year correlations within site ranged from .09 in Portland to .20 in Trenton. The previously reported increase in mother's use of informative techniques for answering the study child's difficult questions occurred at significant magnitudes only for families in Portland, for whom the Year 1 mean level was highest of the three sites but the cross-year correlation was lowest.

The percentage of mothers voting was highest initially in the urban sites, especially Trenton. Cross-year correlations ranged from $\underline{r} = .18$ in Trenton to .66 in Lee County, suggesting very different intrafamily longitudinal patterns within sites. Mothers in Trenton and Lee County indicated the most negative and positive attitudes, respectively, about their local neighborhoods. Thirty-five percent of mothers in Trenton said they would recommend their neighborhoods to friends compared to almost twice as many favorable responses in Lee County (65%). (Cross-year correlations ranged from .21 to .27 across sites.) However, only in Portland was there a significant increase in such recommendations, accompanied by the only significant increase among sites for mothers' identifications of groups or individuals that were successful at improving neighborhood conditions. These site differences undoubtedly reflect the site differences in families' material well-being described earlier.

Educational aspirations for study children increased significantly among mothers in Trenton and Lee County but the corresponding cross-year correlations of .18 and .56 suggested very different patterns for such change: uniform rising expectations across years in Lee County but idiosyncratic changes in Trenton. Educational aspirations did not change longitudinally for study children in Portland perhaps because of their high level in Year 1. Educational expectations for study children increased significantly only among mothers in Lee County where initial levels were intermediate among the three sites. The stability of such expectations in Lee County also was somewhat greater than in Trenton and Portland (*r*s = .70, .47, and .37, respectively).

Of the variables representing mothers' general attitudes about teachers and schools, only one demonstrated significant site differences. With equivalent cross-year correlations within each site (ranging from .27 to .31), mothers in Lee County expressed significantly more favorable attitudes about occasionally keeping study children out of school whereas mothers in Portland expressed the opposite opinion; these attitudes were equivalent across years for mothers in Trenton. These findings may reflect in part the help the older study child can provide on the family farm in rural Lee County. As noted earlier, mothers' feelings of efficacy in dealing with school had increased significantly from Year 1 to Year 6. The percentage of mothers who agreed with the "can improve schools" item increased in both Trenton (from 44% to 69%) and Lee County (from 49% to 66%), but in Portland the percentage remained stable (from 64% to 62%). It should be noted, however, that the Year 6 level was fairly consistent across all three sites. Also, these findings were consistent across racial groups. On the "can disagree with the principal" item, increases were similar across sites and races, except among whites in Portland where there was little increase because even in Year 1 89% of that sample agreed with this item.

Race and sex within and across site. Longitudinal mean levels and correlations for family status/situational characteristics and family processes were examined for systematic changes that were associated within and across sites with race and sex of study children. In addition to our earlier caveats about the confounded relationships among these demographic characteristics, we must again caution the reader about the disproportionalities of numbers of study children in each of these breakdowns (see Tables 2 and 3).

No systematic changes in family status variables were associated across sites with sex of study children. For black families across sites, mean levels of number of household appliances and conveniences increased significantly with the increase most uniform for those families living in Trenton. However, both initial and subsequent mean levels were lower for black than for white families. The mean number of people living in study family homes increased significantly among blacks across sites whereas among whites there was no increase. Among families in Portland, home ownership increased significantly for the black sample but mean levels in Year 6 were still lower than initial levels in Year 1 for the white sample.

Within the black samples in all three sites, changes in father absence were greater for male study children than for females. Thus, in Trenton father absence went from .48 to .56 for black males and from .48 to .47 for black females; comparable changes in Lee County were from .29 to .42 for black males and from .34 to .36 for black females; in Portland changes were from .37 to .48 and from .41 to .49. Two other patterns of change in families of black male study children were singular and consistent across sites and perhaps associated with the above finding: fewer changes of residence and decreased frequencies of mothers' visits to friends and relatives. No rationale can be offered at this time for this cluster of findings.

Previously reported decreases in the number of employed heads-of-households and fathers were consistently but not significantly higher among black study families. Thus, despite the substantially higher percentage of unemployment in black households, for the families in this sample a similar economic decline over the past few years was evidenced for both racial groups.

There were no systematic changes in family processes that were associated systematically with race or sex of study children. There were several specific significant race differences within sites. For example, (a) the previously reported increase in Portland for mother's knowledge of the study child's favorite stories or books occurred among black mothers in that site; (b) increased educational aspirations for study children occurred among mothers of black study children in Lee County; and (c) lower mean category breadth in describing study children's strengths in Year 6 occurred among mothers of white children in Lee County who, as a group, had the most years of formal education. Further examination of the findings for voting participation revealed the greatest reported increase in participation in national elections was among black study families in Trenton where the percentage of mothers who voted in the last national election increased from 47% in Year 1 to 72% in Year 6. Among Lee County black families the increase was from 32% to 41%; in both years voting participation was lowest for this group. Portland black families showed the same Year 6 percentage as Trenton (72%), but the increase was less because of the relatively high Year 1 percentage (64%). Percentage increases among white mothers in Lee County and Portland were comparable to the increases for black mothers, whereas the percentage of the 22 white mothers in Trenton who voted in the preceding national election remained constant at 63% in both years.

Preschool attendance across and within site. Mean levels and correlations across years were examined for families of study children who attended Head Start programs, other preschool programs including private nursery schools and day-care centers, or no preschool program. Again, the reader should keep in mind that study children's race, SES, and preschool attendance are interrelated. Thus, most differences reflected the associated race/SES differences in parental educational and occupational levels and material well-being noted earlier. Despite a greater increase (and higher initial level) in father absence among Head Start families, mean family size and mean number of household appliances and conveniences had increased, perhaps in part due to the fact that many single mothers had moved in with relatives.

There were several significant increases in mean response levels which suggested potential positive consequences of study children's attendance in Head Start programs. First, across all sites, there were increases for Head Start families in other children's attendance in some preschool program. Since in the two urban sites similar increases were obtained among families in which study children had not attended a preschool program, this may reflect a general trend noted elsewhere for more center-based preschool attendance by children from low-income single-parent families; in addition to being confounded to some extent by differential increases in family size. More convincingly, however, the mean number of years in self-improvement classes (excluding full-time high school or college) increased consistently among mothers of Head Start children across sites (especially in Portland where the mean increased from .47 [SD = .50] in Year 1 to 1.04 [SD = 1.30] in Year 6). Finally, mothers' mean expected levels of educational attainment for the study child increased significantly in Lee County for children with Head Start experience (from 11.3 to 12.1). A direct causal link to Head Start cannot be made from the current data since the increased expectations might merely reflect a greater optimism in 1974 than in 1969 for families of lower socioeconomic status; however, these increases do suggest a possible Head Start effect that should be investigated further.

Summary

While status characteristics were relatively stable across the five years of the study, significant group differences were observed for several situational variables, and process variables showed considerable change both in mean level and in relative rankings of families over time. Despite higher levels of unemployment and father absence, study families in Year 6 generally seemed less impoverished, more optimistic, and more involved in school-related activities. Also, mothers tended to be more child-oriented in their interactions with their children (i.e., they used more informative-interactive techniques in response to questions, used less physical punishment, and placed more emphasis on intent [i.e., motivation] than consequences). These changes, however, were small on the average with variation among families in both the direction and degree of change.

Findings generally were similar across geographical region, race, sex of child, and preschool attendance category, although a few salient site and race differences were noted particularly with regard to employment status and material well-being. Although the economic conditions of black families in the study generally had improved over the five years, consistent with national trends (Masters, 1975; National Urban League, 1976), the gap between them and white study families had remained the same or widened. In Trenton, comprising a predominantly black inner-city sample, this finding was most pronounced; little improvement in economic conditions was evidenced there. With the possible exception of more favorable attitudes toward school and greater knowledge and use of community resources, Head Start attendance per se appeared to have had little measurable impact on those maternal attitudes or patterns of family interaction assessed. Further analysis is needed, however, to determine whether certain programs may have been differentially effective (as, for example, those in Lee County where significant increases in mothers' expectations for their child's educational achievement were obtained), or if a longer-term commitment may create meaningful and sustained change (as suggested in the Follow Through analysis described in the previous chapter).

Despite inadequacies in the measurement of these selected variables, the consistency and interpretability of these findings suggest there were true changes in the relative standing of families. The extent to which such changes are due to internal or external influences, however, is unknown. Moreover, some findings (e.g., child-rearing practices) suggest more complex dynamic interdependencies and developmental changes in the meaning of a behavior.

Longitudinal Interrelationships Among Family Variables

In this section the results are presented for the series of correlational analyses in which mothers' responses to all items from the parent interview in Year 1 were related to their responses to all nonidentical items from the subsequent interview in Year 6. In addition, selected variables from the mother-child interaction tasks and First Day of School Question administered in Year 1 were correlated with family variables in Year 6 and those results are described also. Values of rs for relationships throughout this section are reported only when they equal or exceed the .01 level of significance.

Relationships Among Status and Situational Characteristics Across Years

Correlations between early and subsequent status and situational characteristics of study families confirm the findings reported earlier, with correlation coefficients for such stable characteristics as parents' educational and occupational levels exceeding those values for other less stable characteristics such as material well-being. Moreover, longitudinal intercorrelations among these stable characteristics were moderately high with rs ranging in value from .46 between father's and mother's occupational levels to .69 between father's and head-of-household's occupations. Parents' early occupational and educational levels provided the highest correlates across years with other subsequent status and situational characteristics such as indices of material resources in the home (e.g., availability of household appliances and conveniences, separate household facilities for the study child, number of selected child's possessions, and the ratio of rooms-to-people), with rs ranging from .29 to .47. These moderately high correlations accompanied by significant longitudinal increases for these indices of material well-being appear to reflect the familiar pattern of continuously rising levels for families who were relatively high initially.

There were few significant longitudinal correlations between early status and situational characteristics and father absence in Year 6. Father absence was predictable only from head-of-household occupation and home ownership in Year 1 (rs = .32 and .35).

Relationship of Family Status and Situational Characteristics in Year 1 with Family Processes in Year 6

For longitudinal correlations between early status and situational characteristics and subsequent family process variables, the distinctions just described between characteristics of parents' educational and occupational levels on the one hand, and other indices of families' material well-being on the other, were not evident. Rather, correlation coefficients were generally equivalent in magnitude for these early measures of status and situational characteristics. Moreover, the patterns, directions, and magnitudes of significant correlations between early status and situational characteristics in Year 1 with family process variables in Year 6 could not be distinguished generally from the corresponding concurrent relationships of the same variables in Year 6. These patterns of longitudinal correlations are summarized briefly below. Thus, the stability over time of parents' educational and occupational levels and the relatively consistent longitudinal increases for indices of families' material well-being account in large measure for the comparability of patterns of longitudinal and concurrent Year 6 correlations.

Early measures of parents' educational and occupational level and indices of the family's material well-being were related positively to the following family process variables in Year 6: mother's reported informative-interactive response to the study child's difficult questions; knowledge of the child's teacher's name; the study child's possession of a library card; mother's reported frequencies of reading newspapers and magazines; reported frequencies of visits to places of entertainment (with and without the study child along) and excursions outside the home with the study child; mother's reported involvement in various organizations and civic activities including voting; maternal aspirations and expectancies for the child's academic achievement and personal development; and the number of categories the mother mentioned in open-ended descriptions of the study child's strengths and hypothetical good teachers. Negative correlations were found between the same early status and situational characteristics and the following items: mother's use of physical punishment for the study child's misbehaviors; reported frequency of household members other than the mother helping the study child with homework assignments; and the number of community resources such as museums, day-care centers, and clinics that the mother reported was not available. Early measures of adult availability (i.e., the ratio of adults to children in the household) and absence of a father figure in the home generally were unrelated to later measures of family processes.

In addition, early measures of the mother's education and father's/head-of-household's occupational levels were related positively to the mother's expressed educational satisfaction in Year 6; father's/head-of-household's occupational levels were related positively to the mother's favorable recommendation of her neighborhood; and parents' educational levels were related positively to mother's additional schooling (rs for these relationships ranged from .17 to .34). Parents' educational levels in Year 1 were related negatively to the mother's later response that most teachers really want to discuss school matters with parents (rs = -.16 and -.23). Mother's educational level (and other status-situational characteristics in Year 1) was positively related to various responses reflecting the mother's positive evaluations of the study child in Year 6 including the number of activities and responsibilities he/she could perform at age 8, and to indications that the child had special friends, hobbies, and interests. In addition, mother's educational level in Year 1 was related positively to (a) reporting that the study child had had fewer problems than most children learning to read, and (b) mentioning personal qualities as the child's strong points. In contrast, the higher the mother's initial educational level, the less likely she was to mention obedience/cooperation as an area of strength in the study child. As was noted in describing the Year 6 findings, the extent to which these relationships reflect differences in children rather than in their mothers is unknown.

There were no significant longitudinal relationships between early status and situational characteristics and the following family process variables in Year 6: reported frequency of the mother's assisting with the study child's homework and reading stories to him/her; reported frequency of the child's television viewing; mother's use of verbal punishment for the study child's misbehavior; mother's expressed feelings of efficacy in joining neighbors to improve local conditions or in personally disagreeing with school principals; mother's attitudes about local teachers and schools;

mother's individuation and maturity ratings for the study child; and number of different categories the mother mentioned in descriptions of the child's weaknesses and hypothetical good students.

Relationships Among Family Process Variables Across Years

For the sake of clarity and economy in presentation, family process variables in each year are arranged into several *a priori* clusters. Descriptions of longitudinal relationships within each cluster precede discussions of longitudinal correlations across clusters. (The reader should note that longitudinal correlations between equivalent interview items have been described earlier in the section concerned with longitudinal stability and change. Those correlations are not repeated here.)

One group of early variables reflected the mother's diverse interactions with the study child including (a) reported frequency of reading or telling him/her stories and knowledge of the child's favorite stories, (b) reported informative-interactive response to the child's difficult questions, and (c) reported physical and verbal responses to his/her misbehaviors. Only two significant longitudinal correlations were found within these Year 1 variables and their Year 6 counterparts: for mother's frequency of early reading/telling stories to the study child with (a) the child's subsequent possession of a library card ($\underline{r}$ = .16) and (b) mother's later informative-interactive responses to study children's difficult questions ($\underline{r}$ = .18). Both frequency of early reading/telling stories and use of interactive-informative responses to difficult questions were related positively at nearly equal magnitudes to other Year 6 processes including: (a) reported frequencies of reading magazines; (b) mother's attendance at meetings and activities in the study child's school, memberships in education-related and other groups, and voting; (c) mother's expectations of the study child's actual educational attainment; and (d) number of reported activities and responsibilities the study child could perform (rs ranged in value from .15 to .24). The pattern of interrelationships just described for informative-interactive responses to difficult questions in Year 1 to other Year 6 variables corresponds with the same pattern in Year 6 alone described earlier. However, none of the relationships described above for mother's reported frequency of reading to the study child held in Year 6 alone. Such longitudinal change in the meaning of this item parallels previously noted decreases in such reading as well as the finding reported later in Chapter 8 that mothers in Year 6 were apparently reading mostly in cases where study children needed such help (i.e., for those children with low reading-achievement scores). Nearly all Year 1 variables in this cluster were related positively to the mother's expected educational attainment for the study child reported in Year 6 (rs ranged from .16 to .24).

A second group of early variables concerned the mother's exposure to and knowledge about events and activities outside the household. These variables included reported frequencies of reading newspapers and magazines, frequency of visits (with and without the study child) to places of entertainment, and number of excursions outside the home that the mother was accompanied by the study child. The last variable was unrelated to other Year 6 family variables. Frequency of Year 1 reading of magazines was related positively in Year 6 to: mother's informative-interactive response to her child's difficult questions and reported possession by the study child of a library card; frequency of newspaper reading; frequency of attendance at meetings and activities in the study child's school, membership in education-related and other groups, and voting; expressions of efficacy in joining with neighbors to improve local conditions; aspired and expected educational attainment for the study child; reported number of activities and responsibilities the child could perform; and number of different categories mentioned in mother's descriptions of hypothetical good teachers (rs ranged from .16 to .26). Negative longitudinal relationships occurred between this Year 1 variable and the following Year 6 variables: (a) mean ages at which the study child was expected to perform various activities and responsibilities, (b) attitudes that local classrooms were overcrowded, and (c) number of community resources the mother reported as not available (rs ranged from -.15 to -.18). Similar although less numerous longitudinal relationships were found for Year 1 frequencies of newspaper reading and visits to places of entertainment. Magnitudes, directions, and patterns of these longitudinal relationships were virtually identical with corresponding relationships in Year 6.

A third group of early family process variables reflected the mother's involvement in community and civic affairs including memberships in various groups, knowing whom to contact in the community for assistance, frequency of church attendance, and voting. These Year 1 variables were positively interrelated longitudinally to their Year 6 counterparts (rs ranged from .18 to .34, with the highest relationships for early voting and church attendance, on the one hand, with subsequent membership in various organizations). Longitudinal relationships outside this group occurred most often with the Year 1 voting measure and included the following Year 6 variables: study child's possession of a library card; frequencies of mother's newspaper and magazine reading; mother's obtaining additional educational/vocational training; measures of mother's "achievement press" for the study child; and several indices of the mother's "cognitive breadth" and differentiation of the environment (rs ranged from .15 to .30). It also is interesting to note that greater social participation by the mother in Year 1 was associated with her reporting more special friends for her child in Year 6. The patterns of these longitudinal relationships were again similar to those obtained in Year 6.

A fourth group of early family variables concerned expressions of the mother's satisfaction and feelings of efficacy. These variables include the mother's willingness to (a) recommend her neighborhood as a place of residence for friends, and (b) join neighbors to improve the local schools, the mother's feelings of personal efficacy when disagreeing with school principals, and the parents' obtaining of additional education. These variables generally were not correlated longitudinally among themselves, suggesting at least some were more situationally determined. The extent to which the mother felt she could disagree effectively with school principals showed the following significant positive longitudinal correlations with her reported attitudes and behaviors in Year 6: informative-interactive response to her child's difficult questions; frequency of magazine reading; voting and membership in various groups; earlier expected assumption of responsibilities by the study child; and number of activities she reported the child could do (rs ranged from .15 to .24). The last two items appear to reflect parallel independence in mother and child. An additional negative correlation occurred with the number of community resources the mother stated was not available (r = -.22). Parallel relationships occurred for the father's enrollment in additional educational/vocational training in Year 1. The mother's obtaining of additional education was associated with higher subsequent levels of community and school involvement: more frequent attendance at meetings and activities in the study child's school, membership in more groups, voting, and higher educational aspirations and expectations for the child (rs ranged from .16 to .24). These patterns were not as evident from concurrent relationships of these variables in Year 6.

A fifth group of variables concerned the mother's early attitudes about the study child's achievement. These variables, including the mother's aspired and expected level of her child's educational attainment and ages at which she expected the child to perform various activities and responsibilities, were interrelated positively longitudinally (rs ranged from .22 to .48). All three early variables were related positively and equivalently to other Year 6 family variables including: mother's informative-interactive response to her child's difficult questions and the study child reportedly having a library card; frequencies of newspaper and magazine reading and excursions of the mother with the study child outside the home; frequency of the mother's attendance at meetings and activities in the child's school, membership in education-related and other organizations, and voting; number of activities and responsibilities that the mother reported the study child could perform already; and number of categories she mentioned in describing the child's strengths and hypothetical good teachers (rs ranged from .15 to .32 with the highest relationship between early educational expectations and later group memberships). Negative longitudinal relationships occurred between the same early variables and reported frequency of household members other than the mother helping the study child with homework assignments, the mother's expressed belief that schools would be better off with more parental control, and number of community resources the mother said were not available (rs ranged from -.18 to -.34 for the last cited relationship). The patterns, directions, and magnitudes of these relationships were generally similar to those obtained in Year 6.

It should be noted that consistent with the lack of significant correlations obtained in Year 6, maternal individuation and maturity ratings of the study child in Year 1 were not related systematically to the family process variables in Year 6.

A final group of variables represents the mother's awareness and differentiation of her environment. These variables include category breadth in describing the study child's strengths and weaknesses and hypothetical good students and good teachers, and the number of community resources that were indicated unavailable. The only significant longitudinal relationships obtained within this group of variables involved positive relationships between category breadth in describing study children's strong points and hypothetical good teachers and negative relationships between this same variable and reported unavailability of community resources (rs ranged from .15 to .19 and from -.15 to -.23, respectively). For longitudinal relationships of category breadth in describing the study child's strong points with other Year 6 variables, positive relationships were obtained for: the mother's informative-interactive response to her child's difficult questions and the child's possession of a library card; mother-child excursions outside the home; attendance at activities and meetings in the study child's school and membership in education-related and other groups; mother's expected educational attainment for the study child; and the number of activities and responsibilities she reported the child could perform (rs ranged from .15 to .19). Negative longitudinal correlations were obtained between the number of community resources reported to be unavailable in Year 1 and the preceding variables (rs ranged from -.15 to -.23). In addition, this early variable was related negatively to the mother's later frequency of reading newspapers and magazines, voting, knowing the name of her child's teacher, and her educational aspirations for the study child (rs ranged from -.17 to -.20); interestingly, this early variable was related positively to the mother's positive individuation of the study child in Year 6, i.e., describing him/her as above average on favorable characteristics (r = .16). Patterns of the concurrent interrelationships of these same variables in Year 6 were similar in magnitude and direction. However, longitudinal correlations were less extensive and less numerous across other clusters of family variables than the concurrent relationships.

Group differences. These longitudinal correlations were examined for the extent to which findings differed according to the study child's race, sex, and preschool attendance category. Since the few significant differences that were obtained were essentially identical to those described in reporting the relationships among Year 6 variables, they will not be repeated here.

Relationship of scores from Year 1 interaction tasks and First Day of School Question to Year 6 status, situational, and process variables. Supplementary analyses investigated the relationship of selected interaction task and First Day of School Question scores to Year 6 interview measures. Of the seven composite scores from the Eight-Block Sorting Task (Shipman, 1973), two scores had a number of low but consistent significant correlations (in opposite directions) with responses on the Year 6 interview. Score 2 (mother's use of non-specific feedback and a reactive teaching style) and Score 3 (maternal warmth) were both related to head-of-household occupation (rs = -.19 and .22). Similarly, both scores were related to number of selected child's possessions (rs = -.15 and .17) and the crowding index (rs = -.16 and .16). Mother's education was related to maternal warmth (r = .16), and the correlation for Score 1 (requests for obedience) fell just short of statistical significance (r = -.14). Although consistent in direction, these scores were not significantly related to most of the subsequent family process variables (e.g., rs with number of mother's group memberships [-.09 and .12], use of informative-interactive responses to the child's difficult questions [-.12 and .04], number of visits to the school [-.07 and .11], use of physical punishment [.12 and -.08], and achievement aspirations [-.10 and .13]). However, they were correlated with expected level of child's educational attainment (-.15 and .23). It should be noted that 8-Block composite scores 4 through 7 were item specific factors that initially were not correlated with other parent or child measures. Also, the Year 1 results suggested that composite Score 1 should be interpreted as primarily a response to the child's inattention. Thus, apparently reflecting situational demands rather than a stable maternal disposition, subsequent association of Score 1 with later interview responses would be less expected.

The Combined Best Score on the Etch-a-Sketch Interaction Task is dependent on performances of both mother and child in copying the three designs. It had relatively high correlations with the status and situational variables (e.g., r of .37 to mother's education, .34 to head-of-household occupation, and .33 to number of selected household possessions). Similarly, this score was related to a number of maternal process variables including expected educational attainment for the child (r = .28), informative-interactive response to the child's questions (r = .20), and number of group memberships (r = .25). The Total Prediction Categories score from this same task (which reflects the mother's discrepancy between optimum and expected performance) was significantly correlated only with father's and head-of-household's occupation (r = .15 and .16). The score identifying whether or not the mother showed the model to the child during their copying of the designs was not significantly related to either head-of-household occupation (r = -.04) or mother's education (r = .12). With the exception of a correlation of .19 with number of excursions the mother and child take together, another sharing activity, it also was generally uncorrelated with the family process variables.

Examination of the scores from the First Day of School Questions revealed that the scores for Percent Imperative (i.e., use of commands without rationales) and Percent Status-Oriented (i.e., appeals to power or norms) were significantly related to a number of family status and process scores. Since these two scores are highly related and exhibit nearly identical patterns of correlation, only correlations for the Percent Imperative score are presented here. Consistent with previous findings (Hess et al., 1968; Shipman, 1973), this score was negatively related to a number of status and situational variables, including head-of-household occupation (r = -.20), mother's education (r = -.30), and number of selected family possessions (r = -.23). It also was negatively related to a number of process variables, including mother's use of informative-interactive responses to her child's difficult questions (r = -.19), number of maternal visits to the school (r = -.17), mother's voting in the last national election (r = -.19), and educational expectations for the study child (r = -.21). The extent to which the mothers provided (a) specific information and (b) encouraging supportive statements about school in their hypothetical descriptions of what they would tell their children also was associated with parental education and frequency of magazine reading, suggesting the relevance of the parent's amount of schooling for the child's attitudes toward school in providing the child with more informed, positive images.

These findings were generally replicated across groups; again, the magnitude of correlation generally was larger within the white sample with a greater number reaching significance.

Chapter 8

RELATIONSHIP OF FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS TO CHILDREN'S COGNITIVE-PERCEPTUAL PERFORMANCE

It is generally recognized that the family plays a crucial role in the child's cognitive development (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Hanson, 1975; Hess et al., 1968, 1969; Hunt, 1973; White, 1975; White et al., 1973) and how well s/he does in school (e.g., Bridge, 1976; Mayekse, Okada, Cohen, Beaton, & Whistler, 1973). Thus, in the past few years there has been increasing interest in early family intervention programs as a possible means of improving children's academic performance. A logical beginning for such efforts is to determine which family variables appear to have the greatest impact on the child's cognitive development. Indeed, many of the interview items for this report were specifically constructed to assess variables that were, on the basis of available theory, expected to be related to the child's academic achievements.

This chapter, then, describes the relationships of those family status, situational, and process variables described earlier to study children's performance in third grade on two academic achievement measures (the Reading and Math subtests from the Cooperative Primary Tests) and a less school-oriented problem-solving test (Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices). Concurrent relationships are presented first, followed by longitudinal correlations of Year 1 interview scores (i.e., when children were age 3 1/2 to 4) with these Year 6 cognitive measures. Correlations of scores from the Year 1 mother-child interaction tasks and the First Day of School Question with these three measures are then presented. The next section investigates the extent to which knowledge of Year 1 family variables improves on predictions from an early measure of the child's preacademic skills (Year 1 Preschool Inventory). This is followed by an analysis of the extent to which knowledge of longitudinal change on the family variables adds to predictions based solely on the Year 1 interview scores. For the above analyses, differences obtained according to the child's race, preschool attendance category, and sex (across and within race) are presented also.

The final section of this chapter presents the results of a series of regression analyses in which a composite of selected Year 1 family variables was used to predict children's third-grade cognitive performance. In one group of analyses, status and situational variables were entered into the regression equations first, while in a second group, process variables were entered first. These regression analyses also were run separately by sex; race and preschool attendance were included as dummy variables in the regression equations.

Concurrent Relationships in Year 6

Status and Situational Characteristics

As can be seen in Table 10, relationships of family status and situational characteristics to study children's concurrent performance in tests of academic achievement[5] and in the Raven test of analytic-perceptual ability were positive and, in general, moderately high. The two status variables with highest correaltions with study children's performances were father's education (rs ranged from .42 to .55) and head-of-household occupation (rs ranged from .35 to .47). The correlations with mother's education were similar (rs ranged from .38 to .45). Within this predominantly low-income sample, the greater availability of physical resources within the home (e.g., household conveniences, child possessions, space) was associated with children's higher scores. Father absence, however, had only low association, correlating -.20, -.23, and -.10

---

[5] The reader is reminded that since achievement tests were only administered in third-grade classrooms, those children at the extremes, i.e., those who were retained in a grade or advanced on the basis of their school performance, were not included in these analyses.

Table 10

Relationship of Selected Year 6 Family Variables to Child Cognitive Scores

	Read	Math	Raven
Status/Situational			
Head of household occupation	45	47	37
Mother's education	45	43	38
Father's education	55	55	42
Father absence	-20	-23	-10
# household possessions	39	37	34
Crowding index $\left(\frac{\text{rooms}}{\text{people}}\right)$	26	22	23
Separate facilities for child	30	30	24
# moves in last 3 years	-05	-04	-03
# child's possessions	44	42	35
# child's books	39	42	33
I Process			
Mother's response to child's questions	29	25	27
Frequency of homework assistance from mother	-17	-18	-19
Mother reads to child (frequency)	--	--	--
Verbal vs. physical punishment	-19	-20	--
Rationale for punishment given	--	--	--
II			
Mother's newspaper reading (frequency)	27	22	15
Mother's magazine reading (frequency	30	27	21
Number of places child accompanies mother	19	17	--
III			
Frequency of mother's attendance at school activities	--	--	17
Mother voted in last national election	23	22	24
Number of memberships in educational groups	27	31	22
Number of group memberships	27	28	24
Mother's knowledge of teacher's name	20	18	18
IV			
Recommend neighborhood	18	20	--
Feeling of efficacy with principal	--	16	--
Mother's satisfaction with own education	--	--	--
Years of mother's self-improvement classes	--	--	--
V			
Educational aspirations	39	39	29
Educational expectations	48	49	36
Mother's estimate of age at which child should perform certain tasks	-27	-29	-22
VI			
Perception of adequacy of school facilities	--	--	--
Rating of teacher's understanding of local problems	16	18	--
Perception of school overcrowding	-20	-20	--
VII			
Rating of child's maturity	--	--	--
Positive individuation	--	--	--
Negative individuation	--	--	--
VIII			
Awareness of community resources	23	20	25
# diverse areas of child's strengths	24	20	18
# diverse areas of child's weaknesses	--	--	--
# diverse characteristics of "good student"	--	--	--
# diverse characteristics of "good teacher"	19	25	23

Note. $r \geq .15$ significant at .01. Nonsignificant correlations have been deleted and the decimal point omitted from correlation coefficients.

with Reading, Math, and Raven performance, respectively. Residential mobility showed essentially no relationship with the child's performance, although it must be recalled that this variable refers only to moves within the study site; families that moved in or out of the site in the preceding two years are not included in the sample.

Neither of the two variables indicating the birth order of the study child (first born vs. middle vs. last born and only child vs. sibling) were significantly related to any of the cognitive-perceptual scores. Further research is needed to determine whether such effects emerge later, or whether they simply do not exist for this particular sample. In accord with past research (Zajonc, 1976), family size, however, was negatively related to the child's performance (rs = -.23, -.20, and -.16 with Reading, Math, and Raven scores, respectively). Relationships between status and situational variables on the one hand, and Reading and Math scores on the other, appeared relatively stronger than corresponding relationships for Raven scores. However, these differences were not significant statistically.

Family Process Variables

The various indices of direct mother-child interaction assessed in the interview were generally related to the child's cognitive functioning. Mother's reported use of informative-interactive responses to her child's difficult questions was related positively to all three measures of children's cognitive performance (rs ranged from .25 for Math to .29 for Reading). Negative relationships between frequency of mother's helping with the child's homework and all three cognitive measures (rs ranged from -.17 for Reading to -.19 for the Raven scores) suggest that by the time study children were in third grade they apparently received parental assistance in many cases if they were doing poorly. Frequency of the mother's reading to the study child, however, was not related to his or her cognitive performance. The mother's reported use of physical punishment in response to her child's misbehaviors was related negatively to test scores (rs = -.19 for Reading and -.20 for Math). Again, a simple cause-effect or unidirectional relationship cannot be assumed. This last finding may indicate that children who are not performing well generally tend to provoke their mothers more, reflecting perhaps an underlying variable causing difficulties in cognitive, affective, and social functioning.

Children's cognitive performance was related positively to both indirect and direct assumed indices of maternal cognitive stimulation. Correlations with the mother's reported frequency of reading newspapers and magazines ranged from .15 between newspaper reading and Raven scores to .30 between magazine reading and reading achievement. Values of rs were slightly but not significantly higher for magazine reading, probably because of a less constricted range of frequencies for this score than for newspaper reading. In addition, children's academic test performance was related positively to the number of places they accompanied their mother on excursions outside the home (r = .19 for reading and .17 for math). No significant relationships were obtained for frequencies of the mother's visits to friends or to places of public entertainment. Children's cognitive performance also was related positively to measures of their mother's involvement in community and education-related activities (rs ranged from .19 to .31). Similarly, children's performance was related negatively to the number of community resources their mother reported were not available (rs ranged from -.20 to -.25). However, the frequency of the mother's attendance at meetings in the child's school showed a significant correlation only with the child's Raven performance (r = .17).

The mother's expressed belief in her ability to overcome problems in the neighborhood and local schools, and her attitudes toward schools and teachers generally were unrelated to the study child's cognitive performance. As noted in Chapter 7, these attitudes tend to be less stable; thus, if situationally determined and not pervasive and continuing they may not impact on the child. Similar findings were obtained by Slaughter (1975). However, the mother's willingness to recommend her neighborhood to friends and her opinion that many teachers understand the concerns and problems of community residents were related positively to the child's Reading and Math scores (rs ranged from .16 to .20), while her opinion that many local classrooms were overcrowded was related negatively to them (rs = -.20). As was mentioned in the preceding chapter, these relationships may reflect extra-family situational factors; for example, the child in a low status family living in a deteriorating neighborhood may experience poorer schools which, in turn, may account for lower achievement levels.

The strongest relationships between family process variables and study children's cognitive performance occurred for the mother's aspirations and expectations for her child's educational attainment. Correlations of aspirations with Reading, Math, and Raven scores were .39, .39, and .29, respectively. Correlations for the expectation score were slightly (though not significantly) higher (.49, .49, and .36). In accordance with previous research findings, parental achievement press was found to be positively associated with children's cognitive performance. Mean ages at which mothers expected that study children should perform diverse activities and responsibilities (and perform them well) were related negatively to children's cognitive-perceptual performance (rs ranged from -.18 to -.29), that is, those children who performed better were expected to be independent and assume responsibilities at an earlier age. These relationships also suggest that the mother's aspirations and expectations for the study child were based on realistic appraisals of the child's present functioning.

The mother's ratings of her child's maturity and her individuation of the child with respect to positive or negative behaviors (such as superior speaking facility or excessive crying, respectively) were not related to the study child's cognitive performance. As suggested by Slaughter's (1975) findings, the impact of the mother's individuation may not be apparent until later; of course, the results also reflect the small variance in these scores for this sample. However, the number of activities and responsibilities the mother reported her child could perform at the time of the interview was related positively to academic achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from .23 to .31), suggesting moderate generality in children's social competency. Also, the number of different categories mentioned in the mother's descriptions of the study child's strengths and hypothetical good teachers were related positively to cognitive performance (rs ranged from .18 to .24 and from .19 to .25, respectively). These relationships may reflect facilitating experiences provided the child associated with the mother's cognitive abilities. Perhaps, also, these relationships reflect the effects of maternal encouragement and support associated with a general affective attitude that contributes to perceptions of many diverse positive aspects in both children and teachers.

The preceding relationships between family variables and children's concurrent cognitive performances were examined separately for the familiar breakdowns of study families by race, and, within race, by the child's preschool attendance category and sex. Differences between correlation coefficients reported are significant at $p \leq .01$; however, trends of nonsignificant differences are reported if they reflect a consistent pattern of relationships. To assist the reader in interpreting these findings, means and standard deviations for study children's cognitive performances according to these breakdowns are presented in Table B-1 in Appendix B.

Race. Relationships of status characteristics with study children's cognitive performances were generally similar for the two racial groups, but the magnitude of correlations was generally higher within the white sample. The largest differences between such correlations occurred for parents' education and head-of-household occupation, on the one hand, and study children's Reading, Math, and Raven scores, on the other (the most discrepant pair of rs was .45 vs. .05 for head-of-household occupation and Math; rs were .45 vs. .29 for mother's education and Reading). Such differences in the level of correlation across race reflect in part the restricted ranges of these status indicators among the black families in the sample, but also the differential meaning that status indices, particularly occupational status, may signify in the two groups.

Relationships between family process variables and study children's cognitive performance also were generally stronger among white families, especially with respect to children's Math scores. However, it should be noted that the range of Math scores for the black study children was more restricted, and these differences were not statistically significant. The data are at most suggestive of a greater salience of other child and extra-family influences on the black child's acquisition of academic skills.

Preschool attendance. There were no significant differences within the black subgroup between families of study children who had attended Head Start and those with no preschool experience in correlations of status and situational characteristics with study children's cognitive performance, although correlations for the Head Start families tended to be larger.

For relationships between the family process variables and children's scores, nonsignificant differences between the magnitudes of correlations usually favored the "no preschool" families. Such relationships held for correlations between: Reading scores and frequency of mother's newspaper reading (rs = .11 vs. .28); Math scores and mother's memberships in education-related organizations (rs = .03 vs. .23) and mother's expressed willingness to join neighbors in ameliorating local conditions (rs = .10 vs. .36); and Raven scores and mother's memberships in education-related groups (rs = .10 vs. .30). Negative correlations between Reading and Raven scores, on the one hand, and mother's responses that community resources were not available, on the other, appeared to be slightly greater among Head Start families (rs = -.20 and -.24 vs. -.02 and -.09). A tentative hypothesis for the fact that correlations with family process variables tended to be higher for the "no preschool" group is that Head Start may break into the pattern of family causation, perhaps by raising these variables to a more uniform level.

Sex. Differences among correlation coefficients for families classified by sex (within race) of study children reflected mostly the racial differences described earlier for correlations of family variables with children's cognitive performance. An exception to this general pattern was a tendency toward higher relationships between possession of library cards and reading achievement scores for female study children than for males (rs = .35 and .22 for white females and males, respectively, and .33 and .13 for black females and males). As described earlier in Chapter 6, a significantly higher percentage of girls was reported to possess library cards.

Longitudinal Relationships Between Early Family Variables and Subsequent Child Performance

In this section, correlational relationships between those family status/situational characteristics and process variables assessed in study Year 1 when children were age four, and subsequent performance of study children in measures of academic achievement (Reading and Math) and in the Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices Test at age nine, are described. In addition, these results are summarized according to study children's race, sex, and, for black families, category of preschool attendance.

Status and Situational Characteristics

As was found for the Year 6 data, early family status and situational characteristics generally showed moderately high correlations with the child's cognitive functioning at age nine (see Table 11). Parents' early educational and occupational levels were correlated positively with children's academic achievement and Raven scores in Year 6 (rs ranged from .36 to .56) with the highest relationship between father's education and the study child's math achievement. Other early situational characteristics reflecting the physical and material resources available in the child's home environment (e.g., number of household appliances and conveniences, availability of separate household facilities for the study child, and ratio of rooms to people) also were related positively to the study child's achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from .19 to .41) with the highest relationship between number of household conveniences and the child's reading performance. Moreover, families' economic eligibility for Head Start and adult availability (i.e., the ratio of adults to children in the household) in Year 1 were related negatively to study children's achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from -.28 to -.41). As in Year 6, study children's Reading and Math achievement scores in third grade showed a low but significant relationship to absence of a father figure in the home in Year 1 (rs = -.19 and -.21). Other situational variables such as the number of moves the family made since the child was a year old and the external condition of the home were not significantly related to the child's cognitive performance.

Table 11
Relationship of Selected Year 1 Family Variables to Child Cognitive Scores in Year 6

	Read	Math	Raven
Status/Situational			
Head of household occupation	47	49	39
Mother's education	46	46	36
Father's education	54	56	45
Father absence	-14	-18	-10
# household possessions	41	38	40
Crowding index $\left(\frac{\text{rooms}}{\text{people}}\right)$	41	38	28
# moves in last 3 years	-02	-05	-01
Separate facilities for child	34	27	19
I Process			
Mother reads to child (frequency)	31	25	16
Mother's response to child's questions	22	19	20
Verbal vs. physical punishment	16	22	18
II			
Mother's newspaper reading (frequency)	20	15	--
Mother's magazine reading (frequency)	20	--	19
Number of visits	--	--	--
Number of places child accompanies mother	--	--	--
III			
Number of group memberships	22	25	18
Church attendance	--	--	--
Mother voted in last national election	24	22	22
IV			
Recommend neighborhood	--	--	--
Join neighbors to improve neighborhood	--	--	--
Feeling of efficacy with principal	--	--	15
Additional education: mother	19	20	--
Additional education: father	--	23	17
V			
Educational aspirations	24	37	34
Educational expectations	39	42	41
Mother's estimate of age at which child should perform selected PSI items	-31	-23	-26
VI			
Sum of positive attitudes to school	-09	-06	-07
VII			
Negative individuation	-16	-22	-21
Rating of child's maturity	16	23	20
VIII			
Awareness of community resources	23	23	23
# diverse areas of child's strengths	28	29	30
# diverse characteristics of "good student"	--	15	16
# diverse characteristics of "good teacher"	26	27	20
Knowledge of child's favorite story	23	20	--
IX			
Parental control of schools	-16	-20	--
Children have to be made to learn	-15	-16	--

Note. $r \leq .15$ significant at .01. Nonsignificant correlations have been deleted and the decimal point omitted from correlation coefficients.

Family Process Variables

Those family process variables that reflected the mother's early involvement in school-related activities with her preschool-aged child were related positively to the study child's academic achievement scores in third grade. The mother's reported frequency of reading/telling stories to the study child in Year 1, knowledge of the child's favorite stories, and use of interactive-informative responses to his or her difficult questions were positively related to the child's subsequent achievement-test performance (*r*s ranged from .17 to .31) and Raven scores (*r*s ranged from .16 to .20). In addition, the mother's reported use of physical punishment in response to her child's mild misbehaviors was negatively related to these child outcome scores (*r*s ranged from -.17 to -.22). As was described in the preceding section, this significant longitudinal relationship with mother's early reading/telling stories was not confirmed in Year 6. Such discrepancy suggests that these interactions were important during the preschool years for study children's cognitive development but that they were generally ineffective in this regard by the time study children reached third grade. Their early influence may arise from providing an orientation to and readiness for school that affects the child's receptivity to school experiences and the responses of those with whom s/he interacts in the school setting. These findings point out the different meaning behaviors may have depending on the child's developmental level and the need to examine relationships from a more dynamic interactional perspective.

More indirect indices of the mother's early cognitive stimulation showed few significant relationships with the child's later cognitive performance. The frequency of the mother's early excursions outside the home whether accompanied or not by the study child was not related to the child's academic achievement or Raven scores in Year 6. As suggested by the significant positive concurrent relationships obtained for these variables in Year 6, however, such excursions may be more important in later years for children's cognitive achievement or remain effective only to the extent they are continued. In addition, reported frequencies of the mother's newspaper and magazine reading in Year 1 were only marginally related to her child's later achievement (rs = .20 with reading achievement).

The mother's social involvement (e.g., number of group memberships and voting) during the child's preschool years was related positively to the study child's later academic achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from .17 to .25). Magnitudes, direction, and patterns for these longitudinal relationships were similar to concurrent relationships obtained in Year 6.

Early expressions of the mother's satisfaction with situational conditions and of her feelings of efficacy in dealing with such concerns were generally unrelated to child outcome variables in Year 6. However, parents' early participation in activities to advance their education were related positively to their child's subsequent school achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from .17 to .24 with values of rs slightly higher for father's additional education). The parents' participation in additional schooling may have provided an important motivating and modelling influence as well as giving the parents more resources for facilitating their child's development. Again, these correlations may reflect differential effects for variables having sustaining influences, and the consequent greater influence of concurrent parental attitudes and behaviors on the child's performance.

The highest longitudinal correlations between early family process variables and the child's subsequent cognitive performance were obtained for the mother's aspired and expected educational attainments for her child (rs ranged from .28 to .42), with correlations between child scores and expected attainment consistently higher. Such results were comparable in pattern, direction, and magnitude with concurrent relationships obtained in Year 6. Similarly, the mother's early estimations of mean ages at which her child could be expected to perform various school-related activities corresponding to items from the Preschool Inventory were significantly related to the study child's measured achievement (rs ranged from -.23 to -.31, with negative relationships reflecting the mother's press for early accomplishment of these skills and/or her perception of the child's early maturity). Similarly, those children who were rated as more mature by their mothers at age four obtained higher Reading, Math, and Raven scores at age nine (rs ranged from .23 to .31).

Early maternal individuation of the study child with regard to negative characteristics was related negatively to the child's Reading, Math, and Raven scores (rs = -.16, -.22, and -.21); that is, children who at age four were described by their mothers as having more problems than other children their age obtained lower Reading, Math, and Raven scores at age nine. These findings may reflect the child's continued difficulties and his or her mother's early identification of such problems and/or the influence of negative expectations on subsequent behavior. Such patterns were not evident in the concurrent Year 6 relationships for these variables when mothers had a greater tendency to perceive their children as average. However, longitudinal relationships for other indices of the mother's tendency to individuate and to differentiate her environment did show stable positive relationships with her child's cognitive performance. For example, longitudinal relationships between number of categories mothers mentioned in early descriptions of study children's strengths and hypothetical characteristics of good teachers, on the one hand, and child outcome variables, on the other, corresponded in patterns, magnitudes, and directions to the same relationships in Year 6 (rs ranged from .18 to .25). Likewise, mothers' early statements that community resources were not available were related negatively to study children's achievement and Raven scores (rs ranged from -.20 to -.23).

Finally, mothers' early statements that most children must be made to learn and that schools would be better if parents had more control of them were related negatively to study children's subsequent academic achievement (rs ranged from -.15 to -.20). For some mothers, these responses may reflect a more general coerciveness which when observed in parent-child interactions generally has been found to be associated with children's poorer cognitive-perceptual performance. These relationships also may reflect the association of particular child and school-related problems with poorer academic performance.

Group Differences

Examination of these longitudinal relationships separately according to the child's sex, race, and preschool attendance category revealed findings essentially identical to those described earlier for the Year 6 concurrent family-child relationships. No significant differences were obtained for boys or girls or for black families whose child did or did not attend preschool; again, there were fewer significant correlations within the black sample.

Relationship of Scores from Year 1 Interaction Tasks and First Day of School Question to Children's Year 6 Cognitive-Perceptual Performance

The correlations obtained for selected variables from the supplementary analysis relating Year 1 mother-child interaction task and First Day of School Question scores to children's Year 6 cognitive-perceptual scores are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Relationship of Selected Scores from Year 1 Interaction Tasks and First Day of School Question to Year 6 Cognitive-Perceptual Scores

Task	Variables	Reading	Math	Raven
Eight-Block	Nonspecific feedback, reactive style	-.23*	-.18*	-.19*
	Warmth	.24*	.22*	.19*
	Orientation time	.17*	.15*	.09
Etch-A-Sketch	Combined best score	.41*	.48*	.44*
	Total number of attempts	-.01	-.02	-.04
	Model shown	.10	.09	.12*
First Day of School Question	Percent imperative	-.22*	-.24*	-.26*
	Status-norm. appeals	-.19*	-.18*	-.16*
	# of units negative with support	.06	.06	.00
	# of units preparation	.04	.00	.09
	# of units positive affect	.22*	.21*	.18*
	# of units school information	.23*	.20*	.14*
	Percent irrelevant	.11	.12	.14*

*$p \leq .01$

In general, those maternal variables identified in Year 1 as having the strongest concurrent relationships with the child's cognitive scores, i.e., use of a proactive teaching style; requests for verbal feedback; affectionateness; use of positive feedback and praise; reliance on other than status-normative appeals; language specificity; differentiated and positive statements about school (Shipman, 1973), continued to predict cognitive performance in Year 6. The relatively high correlation for the Etch-a-Sketch Combined Best Score, however, may reflect the fact that this score is in part a measure of the child's ability and motivation rather than being primarily a maternal style variable.

Race. As with the interview variables, correlations were generally higher in the white sample. The difference was most striking on the score representing the mother's use of nonspecific feedback and a reactive style on the Eight-Block Sorting Task. In the white sample this score had relatively high correlations to Reading, Math, and Raven scores (-.39, -.30, and -.19 for males and -.43, -.28, and -.31 for females) while in the black sample where such behavior was dominant, the comparable correlations were -.13, -.03, and -.07 for males and -.09, -.12, and -.13 for females. Since concurrent information on these variables is not available, it is not known to what extent these findings reflect group differences in score variability, differential meaning of these behaviors, or differential change in these maternal variables over the five-year period.

Preschool attendance. Paralleling the findings for the interview variables, correlations were generally lower in the black Head Start sample than in the black "no preschool" sample, although differences for individual scores failed to reach statistical significance.

Sex. Although there were no consistent sex differences in the white sample, correlations were generally higher for black females than for black males. An exception to this generalization was the score from the Etch-A-Sketch that indicated whether or not the mother showed the model to her child. For white females this score was significantly negatively related to both reading and math performance (*r*s = -.27 and -.28) while for black females the correlation was positive (*r*s = .19 and .15) and in males of both races there was no correlation (largest absolute value of *r* = .09).

Throughout all these descriptions of longitudinal correlations, there is a temptation to draw conclusions that imply causality of family-to-child relationships. Of course, such conclusions are clearly beyond the kinds of analyses presented. Moreover, a number of the findings, for example, those sex by race interactions described above, clearly suggest more complex reciprocal and interdependent relationships which need to be explored further.

Predictive Power of Year 1 Status and Process Variables Over Predictions Solely From Year 1 Preschool Inventory Scores

There was a relatively substantial correlation between Year 1 and Year 6 estimates of the child's cognitive functioning with rs from the Year 1 Preschool Inventory (PSI) ranging from .52 with the Year 6 Raven to .59 with both reading and math. The Year 1 cognitive score, in turn, was influenced by a number of factors including the family's status, situational, and process characteristics. An important question, then, is the extent to which knowledge of the Year 1 family variables provides unique information which improves predictions of Year 6 cognitive-perceptual scores over what could have been predicted solely from the Year 1 PSI scores. Family status and process variables might be expected to significantly improve predictions from the PSI if they exerted an influence on the child's development that was not already reflected in the Year 1 PSI scores. Significant improvement in predictions also might be found for family variables that were related to components of the Year 6 Reading, Math, and Raven scores that were not measured or were inadequately assessed in the Year 1 Preschool Inventory.

In the analyses presented in this section part (or semi-partial) correlations were used to identify those Year 1 interview variables that significantly improved predictions over what could have been predicted solely from the Year 1 Preschool Inventory scores. Findings for the total longitudinal sample are presented first, followed by summaries of differences in the correlational patterns by sex within race and within the black/low-SES sample by preschool experience. The ns for this analysis were almost identical to the ns for the zero-order Year 1 interview to Year 6 cognitive-perceptual scores correlational analysis, although a few children had to be eliminated because of incomplete or invalid Preschool Inventory scores.

Status and Situational Characteristics

In general, the part correlations were small and statistically non-significant; the magnitude of most of the zero-order correlations that had been significant was substantially reduced after statistically removing the effects of the Year 1 PSI scores.

Parental education, however, was shown to have continuing significant influence, perhaps due to the emergence of new facilitating behaviors associated with the parent's schooling or to associated behaviors that became more relevant to the child's increased maturity. Part correlations for the educational attainment of the mother with the Year 6 Reading, Math, and Raven scores were .22, .21, and .15, respectively. This can be compared to the corresponding zero-order *r*s which were .46, .45, and .36. Part *r*s for father's education were slightly higher (.28, .30, and .20). The same pattern and magnitude of relationships was evident in the part correlations for the census scale scores for father's and head-of-household's occupation (which in most cases overlap). As would be anticipated from the zero-order correlations, mother's occupational level was not significantly related to the Year 6 cognitive-perceptual scores. The only other status or situational variables with part correlations over .20 were the ratio of rooms to number of persons in the household and number of selected household possessions; of the six part correlations for these two variables, the largest was .22.

Family Process Variables

Mother's reported educational expectation for the study child was the only family process variable with a part correlation over .20 with any of the child scores, with part correlations for this variable ranging from .16 with Reading to .21 with the Raven. Zero-order rs for the same score were .39 with Reading and .41 with the Raven. Mother's educational aspiration for the study child was the only other process variable meeting the minimal statistical significance criterion for more than one of the Year 6 scores; its highest part correlation was a .18 with Year 6 Math performance.

Subgroup Analyses

Race. Part correlations for both status/situational and process variables did not differ significantly across the two racial classifications, nor were any clear nonsignificant trends evident.

Preschool attendance. Although differences fell short of statistical significance, a few potentially interesting trends were noted. Items relating to the status of the father (especially father absence and father occupation) appear to have more of an influence on the child's cognitive-perceptual development for economically disadvantaged children who did not attend preschool, indicating perhaps a cumulative kind of deficit. Father absence in the Head Start sample was unrelated to any of the child scores (largest part $r = -.11$); in the "no-preschool" sample, part correlations with the achievement scores also were nonsignificant, but a part r of .30 with Raven scores was noted. The part correlations for father's occupational level in the Head Start sample ranged from .00 to .13; in the "no-preschool" sample, on the other hand, father's occupation had a fairly substantial part correlation with Math ($r = .43$) and Raven scores ($r = .40$), although it was not related to Reading performance ($r = .05$). Of course, sample sizes for this item were reduced due to the number of father-absent families.

Sex. No significant differences in patterns of part correlations were found in the sex-within-race analyses.

Relationship of Longitudinal Change in Family Variables to Year 6 Cognitive-Perceptual Scores

In Chapter 7 changes in family status and process over the five years of the study were presented. In this chapter those changes are related to the Year 6 child outcome measures. For items or item clusters which assessed similar constructs in both years, part correlations were used to statistically remove effects of Year 1 status on that construct from the Year 6 correlations between the interview variable and cognitive-perceptual scores. Thus, if no change occurred, or if changes that occurred were unrelated to cognitive-perceptual performance, the part correlation would be zero, while a significant part correlation would indicate that knowledge of status on that variable in Year 6 added significantly to predictions based on Year 1 status on that variable (i.e., change on that variable is related to the child's cognitive-perceptual performance).

Status and Situational Characteristics

Knowledge of family status in Year 6 generally added little to predictions made from the Year 1 scores, largely because of the stability of these scores. For example, mother's education in Year 1 correlated .88 with the same score in Year 6; thus the Year 6 score provided little additional information. Items relating to the number of household conveniences and appliances and the extent of the child's personal possessions were less stable over time (rs of .56 and .44, respectively), and changes on these variables were significantly related to Year 6 cognitive-perceptual performance, although the magnitude of the part correlations was not large (ranging from .16 to .23). Thus changes in the economic status of the family were associated with the child's learning in the classroom. Other status and situational variables assessed in Year 6 (e.g., crowding index, adult-to-child ratio) added essentially nothing to the predictions from the Year 1 scores.

Family Process Variables

The potency of the educational aspiration and expectation variables was evident in the part correlations. Part rs for the mother's expectation for her child ranged from .20 (for the Raven) to .34 (Math) with part rs for aspirations slightly lower. Thus, mothers who raised their expectations from Year 1 to Year 6 tended to have children who achieved at higher levels. It is not known whether the increased expectations are causally linked with higher achievement or whether the relatively high achievement levels cause mothers to raise their expectations, or whether some external factor affects both expectations and achievement. Simultaneously considering both Year 1 and Year 6 expectation scores in a multiple regression equation yielded multiple rs ranging from .45 (Raven) to .55 (Math). Thus, knowledge of mothers' initial expectations plus their concurrent expectations "explains" about 30% of the variance in third-grade mathematics achievement. The item with the next highest part correlations was the number of groups to which the mother belonged in Year 6, which added slightly to predictions from corresponding Year 1 scores (part rs from .19 [Raven] to .24 [Reading]); the mother's increased social participation was associated with her child's higher performance level. Part correlations of at least .20 (but less than .25) to one or more of the cognitive perceptual variables were found for the following additional process variables: frequency of newspaper and magazine reading, use of informative-interactive responses to the child's difficult questions, number of "don't know" responses to interview items.

Subgroup Analyses

Race. Race differences in the part correlations were generally nonsignificant and quite small. The single exception was the educational expectation item. In the black sample, the part correlation to the child's Math performance was .17, while the corresponding part correlation in the white sample was a significantly higher .49, and for the Raven the part correlations were .07 and .31, respectively. The difference for Reading performance (.19 vs. .38) was not statistically significant but seemed to indicate a similar relationship. These findings reflect the more narrow range of expectations in the black sample and the greater positive change in white mothers' expectations for their child's educational achievement.

Preschool attendance. Part correlations did not differ for those black families who did or did not enroll the study child in Head Start or any other preschool program.

Sex. No significant differences by sex within race were noted in the part correlations.

Regression Analyses

A series of hierarchical regression analyses were performed to assess the extent to which the early indicators of family process predict third-grade cognitive-perceptual performance over and above what could have been predicted solely from the status and situational measures. This analysis also permits investigation of the extent to which simultaneous consideration of multiple measures provides better prediction than consideration of each score separately. Tables 13, 14, and 15 present the results of the hierarchical regression analyses, entering the Year 1 status and situational variables first. The five status/situational variables selected accounted for from 25.0 to 39.8 percent of the total variance in the three criterion scores. The addition of eight of the best process indicators accounted for only an additional 2 to 4 percent of the variance. Entering the variables in

Table 13

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Reading, Status/Situational Variables First

		Total Sample		Male		Female	
	Variable	R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.412	17.0	.430	18.5	.383	14.6
	Crowding index	.495	24.5	.475	22.6	.517	26.8
	Head-of-household occupation	.564	31.9	.550	30.3	.590	34.8
	Race	.599	35.9	.584	34.2	.626	39.1
	Mother's education	.616	37.9	.596	35.6	.644	41.5
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.622	38.7	.611	37.4	.647	41.9
	Rationale for punishment	.627	39.3	.618	38.3	.650	42.2
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.627	39.3	.619	38.3	.650	42.2
	Physical vs. verbal punishment	.627	39.3	.619	38.3	.650	42.2
	Expectation	.627	39.4	.624	38.9	.650	42.2
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.628	39.4	.624	39.0	.652	42.5
	Mother voting	.628	39.4	.624	39.0	.652	42.5
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.628	39.4	.631	39.8	.657	43.1

_N_ = 492

Table 14

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Math, Status/Situational Variables First

		Total Sample		Male		Female	
	Variable	R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.376	14.1	.367	13.5	.383	14.7
	Crowding index	.461	21.3	.432	18.7	.494	24.4
	Head-of-household occupation	.556	30.9	.547	29.9	.570	32.5
	Race	.616	38.0	.644	41.5	.597	35.7
	Mother's education	.631	39.8	.649	42.2	.629	39.6
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.631	39.8	.649	42.2	.630	39.7
	Rationale for punishment	.635	40.4	.654	42.7	.633	40.1
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.635	40.4	.654	42.7	.634	40.2
	Physical vs. verbal punishment	.639	40.9	.654	42.8	.648	42.0
	Expectation	.642	41.2	.659	43.5	.649	42.1
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.642	41.3	.659	43.5	.649	42.1
	Mother voting	.642	41.3	.660	43.5	.650	42.2
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.646	41.8	.670	44.9	.650	42.2

N = 492

Table 15

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Raven, Status/Situational Variables First

		Total Sample		Male		Female	
	Variable	R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.321	10.3	.268	7.2	.385	14.8
	Crowding index	.366	13.4	.318	10.1	.423	17.9
	Head-of-household occupation	.442	.9.5	.364	13.3	.529	28.0
	Race	.488	23.9	.431	18.6	.560	31.3
	Mother's education	.500	25.0	.436	19.0	.582	33.8
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.500	25.0	.436	19.0	.582	33.9
	Rationale for punishment	.505	25.5	.441	19.5	.589	34.7
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.508	25.8	.442	16.6	.594	35.3
	Physical vs. verbal punishment	.513	26.3	.447	19.9	.599	35.8
	Expectation	.536	28.7	.484	23.5	.616	37.9
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.539	29.0	.485	23.5	.627	39.3
	Mother voting	.540	29.1	.487	23.7	.627	39.3
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.540	29.1	.490	24.0	.628	39.4

N = 841

the opposite order led to a somewhat different picture (see Tables 16, 17, and 18). The eight process variables entered first accounted for from 22.1 to 25.0 percent of the total variance, with the five status/situational variables adding an additional 7 to 17 percent. A commonality analysis suggested that the variance shared between the status/situational variables and the process variables was much more important than the unique contribution of either. For example, with the reading criterion, the unique contribution of the process variables accounted for 1.5% of the total reading variance and the unique contribution of the status and situational variables accounted for 14.9%, while the commonality of the two sets accounted for 23%. This is consistent with the reanalysis of Marjoribanks' (1972) data by Harris and McArthur (1974) which suggested the presence of only a single latent factor common to mental ability measures and a variety of status and process environmental indicators. Thus, much of the predictive ability of status measures found in numerous other studies may have been due to variability in family processes that covaried with the status indicators. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the status/situational and process variables are measuring the same thing; instead the association between them might be best understood as reflecting differential provision of opportunities for particular processes to emerge. Although for purely predictive purposes the more reliable status measures may be superior, for explanatory purposes it seems to make more sense to conceive of achievement (e.g., reading performance) as related to what the parent does (e.g., reads to the child) than to a status description (e.g., father's occupation). Moreover, by delineating those attitudes and behaviors associated with SES, guidance is thereby provided for effecting change.

Table 16

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Reading, Process Variables First

		Total Sample		Male		Female	
	Variables	R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.314	9.9	.376	14.1	.258	6.7
	Rationale for punishment	.368	13.5	.427	18.3	.311	9.7
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.398	15.8	.458	21.0	.347	12.1
	Physical vs. verbal punishment	.410	16.8	.463	21.4	.365	13.3
	Expectation	.485	23.5	.555	30.8	.439	19.3
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.490	24.0	.557	31.1	.447	20.0
	Mother voting	.494	24.4	.558	31.1	.454	20.6
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.495	24.5	.577	33.2	.465	21.6
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.533	28.4	.592	35.1	.516	26.6
	Crowding index	.565	32.0	.600	36.0	.580	33.6
	Mother's education	.584	34.1	.604	36.5	.605	36.5
	Head-of-household occupation	.604	36.5	.614	37.6	.635	40.4
	Race	.628	39.4	.631	39.8	.657	43.1
	PSI	.682	46.4	.668	44.7	.716	51.3
	Preschool attendance	.683	46.6	.671	45.0	.716	51.3

N = 492

Table 17

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Math, Process Variables First

	Variables	Total Sample		Male		Female	
		R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.254	6.4	.277	7.7	.227	.051
	Rationale for punishment	.317	10.0	.346	12.0	.282	.080
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.345	11.9	.377	14.3	.306	9.4
	Physical vs. verbal	.383	14.7	.389	15.1	.398	15.9
	Expectation	.490	24.0	.521	27.1	.478	22.8
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.490	24.0	.521	27.2	.478	22.8
	Mother voting	.492	24.2	.522	27.3	.491	24.1
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.500	25.0	.549	30.1	.492	24.2
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.523	27.4	.556	30.9	.531	28.2
	Crowding index	.555	30.9	.572	32.7	.584	34.1
	Mother's education	.574	32.0	.575	33.0	.617	38.1
	Head-of-household occupation	.602	36.3	.602	36.2	.635	40.4
	Race	.646	41.8	.670	44.9	.650	42.2
	PSI	.695	48.4	.710	50.5	.703	49.5
	Preschool attendance	.695	48.4	.711	50.5	.704	49.5

N = 496

Table 18

Controlled Stepwise Regressions to Raven, Process Variables First

Variables		Total Sample		Male		Female	
		R	R^2%	R	R^2%	R	R^2%
Direct Mother Effects	Mother reads to child (frequency)	.161	2.6	.141	1.2	.185	3.4
	Rationale for punishment	.244	5.9	.214	4.6	.280	7.9
	Mother's response to difficult child question	.298	8.9	.250	6.2	.359	12.9
	Physical vs. verbal	.331	10.9	.273	7.5	.402	16.2
	Expectation	.458	21.0	.437	19.1	.505	25.5
Indirect Mother Effects	Mother magazine reading (frequency)	.466	21.7	.438	19.2	.527	27.8
	Mother voting	.470	22.1	.440	19.4	.531	28.2
	Number of groups mother belongs to	.470	22.1	.445	19.8	.531	28.2
Status/ Situational	Number of possessions	.486	23.6	.447	20.0	.564	31.8
	Crowding index	.492	24.2	.453	20.5	.568	32.3
	Mother's education	.497	24.7	.453	20.5	.586	34.3
	Head-of-household occupation	.513	26.3	.458	21.0	.610	37.3
	Race	.540	29.1	.490	24.0	.628	39.4
	PSI	.596	35.5	.561	31.4	.672	45.2
	Preschool attendance	.596	35.6	.561	31.4	.674	45.4

N = 841

Examination of the increments in R^2% among the status variables when they were entered first supported the unique and important contribution of the parent's amount of formal schooling. The association with the child's performance may be viewed as occurring via both education's direct effects on the parent's knowledge and continued seeking of new knowledge (Hyman, Wright, & Reed, 1975) and indirect effects in providing the parent with differential experiences and opportunities (Kohn, 1976).

Investigation of increments in R^2% among the process variables when they were entered first (Tables 16, 17, and 18) again supported the importance of the mother's expectation for her child's educational attainment; it accounted for an additional 6.7% of the reading variance, 9.3% of the math variance, and 10.1% of the Raven variance. On the other hand, after entering the "direct mother effects" and maternal expectation, the "indirect mother effects" added essentially nothing to predictions (1 to 1.1%).

The race variable made a significant contribution to the multiple regression even after entering the other process and status/situational variables. This might occur because of other unmeasured or inadequately measured family characteristics (e.g., more refined indices of impoverishment, motivational differences for academic success) which covary with race. It also might reflect differential allocation of educationally important resources (e.g., textbooks) to blacks and whites or differential treatment by teachers or other members of society affecting the child's acquisition of cognitive skills and performance on tests in the school setting. Other research (e.g., Portes & Wilson, 1976) also suggests the greater importance of affective and social variables for black children in predicting school performance, variables not included in these analyses.

Tables 16, 17, and 18 also indicate that after entering the eight process and five status/situational variables, a direct measure of the child's pre-academic skills (Caldwell's Preschool Inventory [PSI]) predicted an additional 6.4 to 7.0 percent of the variance in the third-grade cognitive-perceptual scores, suggesting the cumulative positive effects arising from the child's early readiness to meet successfully school demands.

Each set of variables made a similar contribution to R^2 for Reading and Math, however the pattern was somewhat different for the Raven criterion. The eight process variables made similar contributions to Reading, Math, and Raven scores (R^2% = 24.5, 25.0, and 22.1), but the five status/situational variables appear to have added more to predictions of Reading and Math (increments of 14.9% and 16.8%) than to predictions of Raven performance (7.0%). By entering the variables in the opposite order approximately the same picture emerged; the status and situational variables appeared to be better predictors for Reading and Math (R^2% = 37.9 and 39.8) than for the Raven (R^2% = 25.0), with the process variables adding approximately equal amounts to all three criterion variables (1.5, 2.0, and 4.1% for Reading, Math, and the Raven, respectively). Although the Reading and Math regression equations were based on a smaller sample (because group testing was conducted only in target classrooms) than the Raven equation, the variance of the status/situational variables was nearly identical in the three samples (e.g., the standard deviation of the number of possessions score was 1.691 in the Reading sample and 1.711 in the Math sample and the standard deviation of the crowding index was .476 in both samples). Thus, the difference in regressions apparently was not caused by sample differences.

Examination of the findings obtained when analyses were performed separately for boys and girls indicated that these differential effects for achievement test and Raven performance were evidenced primarily with boys, reflecting perhaps the greater difficulty experienced by low status boys in meeting school demands (cf. Bridgeman & Shipman, 1975). The results also suggest that these family process variables were more predictive of academic achievement for boys than for girls.

After entering into the regression equation the thirteen descriptors of family status and process and the PSI, all of which were obtained before any study child entered a preschool program, the variable indicating whether or not the child subsequently attended a preschool program was added to the equation. Although regression adjustments are not a substitute for random assignment, they at least provide a less biased estimate of preschool effects than would a comparison of raw means. The preschool variable added nothing to predictions of third-grade cognitive-perceptual performance. Thus, there was no evidence of any effect, positive or negative, of formal preschool experience _per se_ on cognitive-perceptual performance in the third grade. The failure to find a general effect does not rule out the possibility that certain individual programs may be differentially effective for children with different background characteristics or for those whose subsequent school experiences were both positive and congruent. A review of effects of preschool programs (Bronfenbrenner, 1974) also indicates the moderating influence of extent of the parent's participation in the child's learning. Recent studies (e.g., Palmer, 1976; Seitz, Apfel, & Efron, 1976) also suggest that there may "sleeper" effects for early intervention programs with differences in academic performance appearing in the later elementary grades. It also should be noted that these analyses were limited to the child's cognitive performance; the extent to which preschool experience is associated with other important child variables (e.g., affective and social behaviors) or with parent behaviors impacting on younger siblings is unknown.

An additional regression analysis was run in order to determine the increase in prediction possible with the inclusion of a subset of maternal scores from three additional instruments administered in Year 1. Selected were two orthogonal composite scores from the mother-child Eight-Block Sorting Task interaction session (use of nonspecific feedback and frequency of affectionate and positive controlling behaviors), four scores from the First Day of School Question (total message units, number of units with positive affect toward school, number of units describing behaviors/activities already done to prepare the child, percentage of imperative units) and the "model shown" score from the Etch-a-Sketch Interaction Task. These seven scores were entered following the eight family process scores. Slightly smaller samples ($\underline{n}$ = 368 for reading, 374 for math, and 625 for the Raven) were necessary for this analysis, due to the number of missing scores on the interaction tasks. These seven scores accounted for only an additional 2.5 to 3.6 percent of the variance in the criterion measures (for reading $R^2\%$ increased from 25.2 to 28.8, for math from 25.7 to 28.5, and for the Raven from 24.6 to 27.1). Thus, to a large extent the process variables in the interview apparently already reflect most of the predictive variance in the selected process scores from the interaction tasks and First Day of School Question. The status and situational variables still added significantly to the regression after the above variables were included; for reading $R^2\%$ increased by 12.1, for math it increased by 14.1, and for the Raven the increase was 5.5.

Further examination of the findings according to the study child's sex suggested, however, that these predominantly verbal interaction measures were more highly related to the girls' cognitive performance. Comparing these data with the interview findings it appears that different maternal behaviors may account for cognitive differences in boys and girls.

Summary

In accord with past research, the results of the various analyses described in this chapter indicate the important role of family circumstances and behaviors in the child's cognitive development. Moreover, the findings suggest the interrelatedness of status, situational and process characteristics as they impact on the child. In addition, those differences in results obtained across subgroups and time periods point out the importance of (1) recognizing the different meanings behaviors may have depending on the child's developmental level and the larger social context and (2) examining relationships from a more comprehensive and dynamic interactional perspective.

Chapter 9

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In a continuing programmatic effort to understand the child's development in interaction with his or her environment, the present study investigated the interrelationships among status, situational, and process variables describing the child's home environment and the relationship of these variables to the child's cognitive-perceptual performance when study children were 8 1/2 to 9 years of age. In describing the findings results were organized in three major areas. First, a description of the responses of the 1212 mothers or mother-surrogates interviewed in the three sites (Lee County, Alabama; Portland, Oregon; and Trenton, New Jersey) was presented. Response frequencies and patterns of relationships within and among status, situational, and process variables were described for the total sample with salient differences noted according to geographical region, race, and the study child's sex and preschool experience (i.e., Head Start, Other Preschool, and No Preschool). Second, for the 863 families who also were interviewed five years earlier, the data provided an index of the stability and change in mean levels and patterns of relationship among those status, situational, and process characteristics assessed at both time periods. The third set of findings pertained to the relationship of family variables to the child's academic achievement (Cooperative Primary Math and Reading Tests) and less-school-related problem-solving ability (Raven Coloured Progressive Matrices Test). Information was provided both on concurrent relationships and on the extent of impact of early influences on the child's later cognitive-perceptual performance. For the latter, part correlations also were obtained to investigate (a) the extent to which these measures contributed to predictions beyond that provided by the variance they shared in common with the child's preacademic skills (Preschool Inventory performance at age four) and (b) the extent to which change on these family variables accounted for the child's performance at age nine. For all analyses, the extent to which findings differed according to geographical region and the child's sex, race, and previous preschool experience also was examined.

The major findings from the Year 6 interview responses can be summarized as follows: 1) On the average, parents in study families had approximately 11 years of formal schooling and worked in blue-collar jobs. More than half the mothers of study children were employed. Although generally economically disadvantaged, most families could not be classified as extremely impoverished. However, in 36% of the families fathers were absent, and for 18% public assistance was the main source of support. 2) Within this relatively narrow socioeconomic range, considerable variation in family processes was observed. Thus, families within the same parental occupational and educational levels and with similar material resources varied in their (a) interactive patterns with study children, (b) attitudes toward local schools and education, (c) use and knowledge of community resources, (d) participation in extra-family activities, (e) feelings of efficacy and optimism, (f) support of school-related activities, and (g) perceptions of the study child. In examining correlations between status/situational characteristics and the mother's reported interactions with her child, at best less than 13% of the variance in any of these behaviors could be explained by any one of the status or situational variables. 3) Various indices of socioeconomic status showed only moderate intercorrelation, suggesting that no single index should be used as a general proxy for SES and indicating the complex dimensionality of social stratification. 4) Congruent with other research findings, few variables were found to correlate with father absence and residential mobility per se; each family apparently develops a unique way of coping with these stresses, and no single set of processes can be used to characterize all father-absent or mobile families. 5) Patterns of relationships among a priori item clusters provided support for the convergent validity of item interpretation; the generally low correlations across these groups of items, however, indicated the diversity of processes assessed by the interview.

Examination of the stability of family characteristics revealed the following findings: 1) Although status characteristics showed moderate to high stability over the six-year period, process variables showed considerable individual change. Thus, even though family status remains relatively constant over a number of years, the way in which the family operates within the environment may change considerably. 2) Corresponding to increases in the single-parent homes and in male unemployment in two-parent families, significantly more mothers in the study sample were employed in Year 6. 3) Despite the previous statistics, for those families who remained in the study, general increase in material well-being, greater feelings of optimism, more favorable attitudes toward school, more child-oriented attitudes and behaviors, and more active involvement in school-related activities were evidenced. Families were not uniform or consistent in the direction or degree of change, however, indicating the need for further study to explain such differences.

The major findings from the several analyses of the relationships of family status, situational, and process variables to children's cognitive performance can be summarized as follows: 1) In agreement with Hanson (1975) who found moderate to high positive relationships between home environmental variables and children's IQ across three time periods (0-3, 4-6, and 7-10 years), concurrent and longitudinal patterns of correlations between family variables and third-grade cognitive-perceptual scores were similar, although the function of certain individual items (e.g., amount of maternal reading to the child) apparently shifted across years. In the example cited, the results suggested that the change was in the expression of the variable rather than in the variable itself since the mother's reading to her child at age four was significantly correlated with the child's possession of a library card at age nine. 2) Status and situational variables generally had moderately high positive correlations with the child's performance, with parents' amount of formal schooling having the strongest relationship. Again, father absence and residential mobility showed little or no relationship, respectively, to the child scores. Similarly, Solomon, Hirsch, Scheinfeld, and Stein (1972) and Wasserman (1972) found no significant difference in the school achievement of lower-class black elementary school students from father-present and father-absent homes. 3) Those family variables which were found to be related to the child's cognitive-perceptual performance at age four tended to continue to be associated with the child's academic skills and more general problem-solving ability at age nine. The various indices of physical and psychological resources in the home, extent of maternal encouragement and involvement with the child in school-related tasks and achievement expectations for him/her, use of alternatives to physical punishment in response to the child's misbehavior, and knowledge and use of community resources were positively associated with the child's performance on a variety of cognitive and perceptual tasks. In accord with Slaughter's (1975) findings, certain process variables with low stability appeared to be more situationally determined (e.g., attitudes toward school and feelings of efficacy in resolving school and community difficulties) and were not correlated with the child's cognitive performance. 4) Results from the First Day of School

Question and structured mother-child interaction situations administered in Year 1 provided evidence for a facilitating effect on the child's cognitive development of maternal warmth, use of more specific language, greater reliance on verbal feedback from the child, encouragement of verbalization, use of positive versus negative controlling techniques, the provision of rationales based on feelings and logical consequences rather than on power and normative expectancies, and extent of supportive statements about early school experiences. 5) Changes over time in a few variables (e.g., mother's expectations for the study child's educational attainment, use of informative-interactive responses to the child's difficult questions, mother's participation and involvement in community activities, frequency of newspaper and magazine reading, and material resources in the home) contributed significantly to accounting for the child's achievement. The potency of the expectancy variable was particularly evidenced. Simultaneously considering both Year 1 and Year 6 expectation scores in a multiple regression equation yielded a multiple $\underline{R}$ from .45 to .55. Thus, even though early influences are undoubtedly important, family assistance programs that started after the child was age four might still have a significant impact on the future achievements of that child. 6) There were few significant part correlations between early measures of the child's home environment and the child's third-grade reading, math, and Raven performance after controlling for the child's level of preacademic skills at age four. This does not imply that continuation of such activities is unimportant (or that later family behaviors were not influential), but only that their influence was not different from that measured earlier. These findings also indicate the influence of the child's early orientation and readiness for school on his or her subsequent school performance. The fact that significant part correlations were obtained for parental education and the mother's membership in groups probably reflected the additional resources for facilitating the child's educational progress that these experiences provided.

Status/situational and process variables shared considerable commonality in their prediction of the child's subsequent reading, math, and Raven performance; the process variables, however, help provide important explanatory information and programmatic clues that are not obvious from status characteristics alone. (Recent study findings [Shipman, 1976] suggest that for the most impoverished children in the study sample, family process variables rather than status/situational variables are more predictive of a child's reading and math performance.) As static group categories are replaced by delineation of those behavioral and attitudinal variables reflecting processes which link social and cultural environments to the emerging capabilities of young children, meaningful SES relationships may be determined. As was pointed out in the text, the association between status/situational and process variables might be best understood as reflecting differences in opportunities provided for particular process variables to emerge. Thus, a higher level of parental education is associated with greater academic knowledge, increased awareness of public affairs and popular culture, more informed perceptions of school, and continued seeking of new knowledge as in reading books and magazines (cf. Hyman et al., 1975), all of which may have impact on the child's knowledge and motivation for learning. In addition, by providing differential opportunities for the parent's participation in society, there may be indirect effects upon the child via parental attitudes and child-rearing behaviors acquired through such experiences. Another example of the interrelatedness of status, situational and process variables is the commonly found association between low economic status, high household density, and parental use of physical punishment with their children.

These negative effects of crowding have been shown to be exacerbated by additional stresses in the home (Booth & Edwards, 1976). Family process variables are thus considered as the underlying mechanisms by which child outcome differences associated with family status characteristics are created and maintained.

Results of the regression analyses performed clearly point out not only the interrelated but the cumulative effects of these family variables on the child's academic achievement and cognitive-perceptual performance. For example, the child reared in a home with stresses associated with poverty, with little educational enrichment or encouragement, and limited stimulation outside the home either directly or indirectly via the mother's involvement, would be expected to show greater impairment in functioning than the child reared under equally impoverished conditions, but whose parent is actively engaged in the community. In the first case, the mother's alienation may reflect a general depression which accentuates the debilitating life circumstances for the child; in the second, the mother's participation may reflect a belief in her ability to determine consequences (internal locus of control), thereby providing a motivational model for the child, in addition to increasing the child's exposure to stimulating experiences in a more varied environment.

Findings were generally replicated across site, race, sex, and preschool enrollment categories. As would be expected, except for a few items pertaining to the child's interests and activities (with girls perceived as more mature, responsible, and more interested and competent in academic skills, particularly reading), no significant differences in family characteristics were found for those study parents of boys and girls. Several significant differences, however, were obtained according to region, race, and preschool attendance category.

As was found in our initial description of study families, those families who were black, enrolled the study child in Head Start, or lived in Trenton's crowded urban environs, were most economically impoverished. Despite the general increase in material well-being, race/SES gaps remained, and for the limited number of inner-city black families in the sample, economic conditions generally had deteriorated. Consistent with recent census figures, father absence was significantly higher in black families (46% vs. 14%) and had increased significantly in the six-year period. Unemployment rates also were significantly higher for black fathers and heads-of-household, although rates of change were not different for black and white study families. Consistent with earlier study findings (Shipman, 1972a), a significantly smaller correlation was obtained in black families between parents' educational and occupational levels and between occupational level and children's performance. Thus, in accord with Stricker's (1976) recent findings, occupational status appears to have a different meaning for black and white families. Race differences in the magnitude of correlations between family variables and the child's cognitive-perceptual performance suggested black children's performance was affected to a greater extent by other child and extra-family influences, although slightly lower reliabilities in the criterion scores for the black sample may have accounted for some of the race differences. Slaughter (1975) suggests, however, that such differences in the predictability of the child's cognitive performance in school may indicate the discontinuity of the low-income black child's home and school experiences; and Portes and Wilson (1976) have described the relatively greater role that self-esteem and achievement aspirations play in black students' educational attainment as a function of their "outsider" status.

As many recent writers have pointed out (e.g., Edwards, 1975; Pettigrew, 1976; Slaughter, 1975), the existing literature has emphasized the adverse influences of black low-income parents' childrearing practices upon the socialization of achievement motivation and cognitive processes in their young children (cf. Freeberg & Payne, 1967; Hess, 1970). In accord with our earlier discussion of the interrelatedness of status, situation, and process variables, we need to examine further the extent to which family socialization practices derive from existing social conditions (i.e., from extra-family variables rather than intra-family traits). Thus, for example, greater attention should be paid to how economic policies and conditions affect family structure and consequent interactions. To many, such examination of black low-income families in the United States appears imperative (Comer & Poussaint, 1975; Keniston, 1976; Pettigrew, 1976). Similarly, the greater emphasis by black mothers on their child's obedience may be viewed as an adaptive response to their perception of what a black child must do to succeed in a white middle-class-dominant society (cf. Comer & Poussaint, 1975).

Although there was no apparent general effect of Head Start (or other preschool) experience on the child's third-grade test performance, comparative findings for black low-SES families who did and did not send their children to Head Start suggested benefits to Head Start mothers that have potential long-term impact (i.e., in contrast to black Head Start-eligible mothers whose child had not attended any preschool program, more Head Start mothers had taken courses to further their education and they had higher aspirations for their child's educational achievement). In addition, their feelings of efficacy and attitudes towards education in general and the child's school in particular were at least as high as those for the "no preschool" sample which was of higher socio-economic status. Head Start participation may have acted to reduce the influence of status variables. In retrospect, Head Start parents emphasized the academic benefits they perceived their child had obtained while attending Head Start. Black Head Start families whose children were enrolled in Follow Through programs in Year 6 (third grade) significantly differed from black non-Follow Through Head Start families in reported participation and involvement in both school and other community activities and in the obtaining of medical and dental services for their children. These data suggest the value of such continued broad-range services in the schools for families similar to those in the study. The fact that predictive correlations from family status and process to third-grade outcome variables tend to be weaker for those who experienced preschool suggests that the preschool experience may be influential in disrupting the dismal cycle of determinism that has been the lot of many children of poverty-stricken families by effecting changes in the family and/or the children.

It also should be pointed out that the fact that families in this predominantly low-SES sample showed a significant increase in feelings of optimism and efficacy, participation in school activities, knowledge and use of community resources, and aspirations and expectations for their children's educational achievement may reflect in part diffusion effects of community-action programs such as Head Start. As the Kirschner Associates report (1970) indicated, agencies (e.g., hospitals, schools) in those communities in which Head Start was located showed significant positive changes in attitudes and behaviors affecting low-income families. Thus, cohort effects may be evident that have a basis in the fact that all families resided in communities where Head Start was available. Moreover, the increased emphasis in the seventies on parent involvement in the education of their children which may be reflected in these findings, may be viewed as an out-growth of family-centered child development programs such as Head Start.

In describing these group differences, however, the reader has been cautioned throughout the report that a number of variables used to describe groups are confounded. For example, preschool program within the black sample is confounded with site, and to a slight degree with socioeconomic status. Differences between sites are confounded with region of the country, urbanness, socioeconomic status, and perhaps many other unknown variables. When the groups being compared differ on several variables we cannot be sure which of them is most explanatory of any differences in means that are observed or whether an important explanatory variable was not measured. Moreover, these sites are not a random sample of a population of communities nor are the children in the sites a random sample of the children in these areas or of any definable population of disadvantaged children. Thus, these data do not allow us to extrapolate to proportions of Head Start children in general. Consequently, any interpretation of group differences presented in the report should be regarded as tentative. But the power of overwhelming evidence should not be overlooked such as a major effect occurring in all three sites (e.g., the strong association of expected educational attainment with the child's achievement) or large differences found among sites (e.g., significantly higher unemployment rates in the urban sites). Such findings need to be replicated.

Implications for Social and Educational Policy

During the past 15 years the influence of the family, especially the mother, on the cognitive development of the young child has become increasingly recognized and researched (Hess et al., 1968, 1969; Lytton, 1971; Schaefer, 1972; White, 1975; White et al., 1973). This recognition is currently exemplified by the impetus given to the development of programs and materials to facilitate parent involvement during these early years (Gordon, 1976; Honig, 1975). The present findings support the importance of early parent-child interactions as well as the child's early acquisition of school-relevant skills and motivation and those programs such as Head Start which emphasize parents' involvement in the child's educational experience. The importance of developmental guidelines for day-care programs also is evident.

The results also indicate that changes in family processes that have significance for the child's cognitive development and educational progress can and do occur. In discussing early influences on the child's later acquisition of school skills and the stability of family characteristics, emphasis has been placed, therefore, on the flexibility of the organism and on the complex developing interactions that occur between the child, the family setting in which his/her development is embedded, and the larger society. Neither the child nor his or her environment is static. Prediction is not determinism. Our responsibility is to determine how to promote those changes that will facilitate the development of all members of society. A salient variable in the present study for understanding the child's school success was the mother's level of educational aspirations and expectations for her child. We need to delineate those factors affecting such levels (e.g., provision of contingent positive feedback for achievement efforts, availability of family support systems, experiences which enhance each family member's self-esteem, potency, and resources). Increased educational and job opportunities could be one source of change. Also, the present findings suggest that the mother's level of aspiration is directly tied to the child's *early* signs of intellectual alertness. If so, the implication is that early cognitive stimulation from within or outside the home is important for the mother *subsequently* to provide a continuously stimulating climate. This reciprocity and interdependence in behaviors was evident in recent findings reported by Falender and Heber (1975) whereby changes induced in the child by extrafamilial stimulation had the additional result of inducing changes in the mother's interactions with the child. Consistent with previous research (Hess et al., 1968, 1969), the present findings suggest that as the mother interacts more, she feels less powerless, more optimistic and is less likely to resort to status and authoritarian appeals for controlling her child. Thus, programs reducing alienation may in turn increase the child's educability. We would also expect that as a result of the parents' participation in early intervention programs the family would become less alienated from the educational system and would come to define school not only in a more positive way, but also in a more differentiated fashion. This, in turn, should provide the child with more adequate and useful images of the school, of the teacher, and of the role of active student.

Support also is provided for the widespread facilitative effects of economic support to impoverished families. For families with extremely limited resources, not only do such changes in material resources obviously affect the immediate well-being of family members but in some direct or indirect manner apparently influence the child's school success and consequently the probability for his or her future growth and achievement. The findings also suggested particular areas of need for improved delivery of social services to poor families. Despite the low representation in the study sample of those in the most impoverished circumstances, a considerable-sized minority of mothers reported that: 1) their child had not been to a doctor since entering grade school; 2) they had no friends; and 3) their child had a problem which was of serious concern.

As the present data indicate, most study families feel positively toward the schools and value highly their child's educational attainment. Given their children's early interest and enjoyment in school (Bridgeman & Shipman, 1975), there is powerful potential support for creative instructional approaches that meet the diversity of children's needs and enhance their development. But for many economically disadvantaged families there was considerable discrepancy between aspirations and expectations for their child's educational attainment. The data provide suggestions for areas needing improvement if there is to be closer liaison between home and school and pooling of resources to enhance the child's development. The majority of parents in the present sample felt that most teachers in their child's school do not understand community needs. Also, although a number of parents visited their child's school and assisted with extracurricular activities, very few had been involved in discussions of the curriculum their child received. A substantial number of families would appear to require concerted outreach efforts from the schools; 19% of the mothers did not know the name of their child's teacher. The lower correlations within black families between family variables and child achievement also suggest further examination of differential educational treatment according to race. There was some indication in the findings that the more impoverished study families experienced more impoverished educational conditions for their children.

A major policy implication of the present study is that although SES, ethnicity, sex, region of residence, may be important as group indicators for political purposes, they may be irrelevant as functional indicators for purposes of educational design and planning. As Bridge (1976) found in working with the schools, usual classification by family structure, ethnicity and income are less useful than assessing the attitudes and childrearing values of the families involved. Low-income parents are not a homogeneous group.

Implications for Future Research

Many of the results reported here are only suggestive of potential avenues for future research. For example, the current data suggest that future evaluations of Head Start should more carefully investigate potential impacts on mothers, particularly in the areas of the mothers' furthering their own educations and actively participating in their children's schooling. These impacts on mothers might not have any immediate measurable effects on their children, but might influence attitudes and achievement years after graduation from Head Start. Effects on subsequent children might be stronger and appear earlier. Young children from large families in which the mothers were active participants in Head Start programs for a number of years could be compared to similar families in which mothers had not been involved with Head Start or any similar programs. Also, in the present study only broad preschool attendance categories were used; future analyses should investigate possible differential effects due to particular program and participant characteristics. Of particular importance would be the extent to which parents were involved in learning activities they could carry out with their children (Bronfenbrenner, 1974).

The predictive power of educational expectancy, and in changes in expectancy over time, suggests the importance of more fully exploring this variable. Although the mother's expectancies for her child's educational attainment were clearly related to the amount of schooling she received, the correlation between these two relatively reliable variables is low enough to indicate the importance of other factors. It eventually might be possible to identify methods of modifying mothers' expectancies with positive consequences for their children, although such attempts at manipulation may simply destroy the correlation between expectancies and achievement.

The present report focused on those findings generally characteristic of the study sample and major participant categories (i.e., geographical region, race, and child's sex and preschool experience). Greater understanding of the relationships investigated in this study should be provided by further analysis of those longitudinal families who did and did not change on status, situational, and process variables, focusing on comparison of those who showed positive and negative change (e.g., comparisons among the parents and children in families who showed upward or downward mobility during the five-year period). Future analysis also should examine the differential predictive findings obtained by sex (within race) of child and nature of the cognitive task (i.e., achievement tests vs. Raven). For example, the Raven may be viewed as relatively more "culture free" compared to the academic achievement measures and thus motivational and cognitive style differences may be more free to operate. Also, possible differential effects on child behaviors for certain variable combinations, as suggested by Emmerich's (1977) recent study findings, need to be explored further.

The current report clearly demonstrates the importance of a variety of family influences on children's cognitive development. Yet it is also clear that the variables assessed account for only a fraction of the variability in third-grade performance. Future research should also focus on the other potentially important determinants of school success, in particular more detailed study is needed on the influence of early classroom experiences and the interaction between home and school experiences. As has been emphasized at several points in this report, there is considerable need for further investigation of the complementarity of roles various socializing agents (e.g., home, school, peers) play in affecting the child's school performance. Any attempt to assess causal priorities among family, school and child variables, however, represents an oversimplification of a system in which reciprocal causation is possible and even probable. The present study is viewed as one step in a programmatic effort to understand how these various socializing agents interact to enhance or interfere with the child's development. In accord with Sameroff's (1975) view, such interactions are seen as a continual and progressive interplay between the organism and its environment. Some of these dynamic interdependencies were seen in the mother's change in response as a function of her child's developmental level and in changes in situational variables affecting process variables and thereby child outcomes. Future research efforts will be increasingly focused on further examination of such dynamic interactions.

Conclusion

The present study has focused largely on cognitive correlates of family status and process variables. But cognitive functioning is only one aspect of the child's adaptation in the classroom. The child's adaptation includes his or her feelings and behaviors toward self, peers, and the school. In addition, the interactions of such attitudes and behaviors with the child's cognitive competencies and with school task demands are critical components of adaptation to the school setting. In order to enhance such adaptation, we need to better understand the nature of such attitudes and behaviors and those home and school variables influencing their development. In contrast to our understanding of children's cognitive development, however, our understanding of children's affective and social development and those factors influencing such development is meager. To a large extent, this is due to less well-articulated theories of such development and a paucity of adequate instrumentation for assessing it. Future reports will attempt to provide data to help fill in these gaps through a longitudinal analysis of the effects of family style and classroom climate on the social adaptation of low-SES children during the primary grades.

REFERENCES

Baldwin, A. L., Kalhorn, J., & Breese, F. H. The appraisal of parent behavior. *Psychological Monographs*, 1949, *63* (4, Whole No. 299).

Booth, A., & Edwards, J. N. Crowding and family relations. *American Sociological Review*, 1976, *41*, 308-321.

Bridge, R. G. Parent participation in school innovations. *Teachers College Record*, 1976, *77*, 367-384.

Bridgeman, B., & Shipman, V. C. *Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Predictive value of measures of self-esteem and achievement motivation in four- to nine-year-old low-income children* (PR 75-24). (Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.) Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Bronfenbrenner, U. *A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs. Volume II: Is early intervention effective?*, (DHEW Publication No. [OHD] 75-25). U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development, 1974.

Caldwell, B. M. The effects of psychosocial deprivation on human development in infancy. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 1970, *16* (3), 260-277.

Clausen, J. Perspectives on childhood socialization. In J. Clausen (Ed.), *Socialization and society*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968.

Comer, J. P., & Poussaint, A. F. *Black child care. How to bring up a healthy black child in America: A guide to emotional and psychological development*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.

Cooperative Test Division. *Handbook: Cooperative Primary Tests*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Cooperative Tests and Service. *Preschool Inventory revised edition - 1970: Handbook*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Dave, R. H. *The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Educational Testing Service. *Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Preliminary description of the initial sample prior to school enrollment* (PR 70-20, 2 vols.). Prepared under Grant CG-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, August 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.: Vol. I, ED 047 797; Vol. II, ED 047 798)

Edwards, R. M. Race and class in early childhood education. Young Children, 1975, 30, 401-411.

Emmerich, W. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Structure and development of personal-social behaviors in preschool settings (PR 71-20). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 971)

Emmerich, W. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Preschool personal-social behaviors: Relationships with socioeconomic status, cognitive skills, and tempo (PR 73-33). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 086 372)

Emmerich, W. Structure and development of personal-social behaviors in economically disadvantaged preschool children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1977, in press.

Falender, C. A., & Heber, R. Mother-child interaction and participation in a longitudinal intervention program. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 830-836.

Freeberg, N. E., & Payne, D. T. Dimensions of parental practice concerned with cognitive development in the preschool child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1967, 3, 245-261.

Gallup, G. H. Eighth Annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, October 1976.

Gordon, I. J. Parenting, teaching, and child development. Young Children, 1976, 31, 173-183.

Hanson, R. A. Consistency and stability of home environmental measures related to IQ. Child Development, 1975, 46, 470-480.

Harris, C. W., & McArthur, D. L. Another view of the relation of environment to mental abilities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 457-459.

Hess, R. D. Social class and ethnic influences on socialization. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. II. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1970, 457-558.

Hess, R. D., Shipman, V. C., Brophy, J. E., & Bear, R. M. The cognitive environments of urban preschool children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Hess, R. D., Shipman, V. C., Brophy, J. E., & Bear, R. M. The cognitive environments of urban preschool children: Follow-up phase. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Honig, A. Parent involvement in early childhood education. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1975.

Hunt, J. McV. Heredity, environment, and class or ethnic differences. In Assessment in a pluralistic society: Proceedings of the 1972 Invitational Conference in Testing Problems. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973, 3-36.

Hyman, H. H., Wright, C. R., & Reed, J. S. The enduring effect of education. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Keniston, K. Do Americans really like children? Paper presented at the meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., 1976.

Kirschner Associates, Inc. A national survey of the impacts of Head Start centers on community institutions. Contract No. B89-4638, prepared for the Office of Child Development, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parental values: Another confirmation of the relationship. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 538-545.

Light, R. J., & Smith, P. V. Statistical issues in social allocation models of intelligence: A review and a response. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 351-367.

Lytton, H. Observation studies of parent-child interaction: A methodological review. Child Development, 1971, 42, 651-681.

Marjoribanks, K. Environment, social class, and mental abilities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 103-109.

Masters, S. H. Black-white income differentials: Empirical studies and policy implications. Institute for Research on Poverty Monograph Series. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Mayekse, G., Okada, T., Cohen, W. M., Beaton, A. E., & Whistler, E. C. A study of our nation's students. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Urban League, Inc. Special policy report on the socioeconomic status of blacks. Washington, D.C., August 1976.

Palmer, F. H. The evidence for early childhood intervention and subsequent elementary school performance. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1976.

Pavenstedt, E. A comparison of the child-rearing environment of upper-lower and very low-lower class families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35, 89-98.

Pettigrew, L. E. Economic theory and practice: Its effects on black family stability. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1976.

Portes, A., & Wilson, K. L. Black-white differences in educational attainment. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 414-431.

Research Triangle Institute. A report on two national samples of Head Start classes: Some aspects of child development of participants in full year 1967-1968 and 1968-1969 programs. Final report to Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, 1972.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Sameroff, A. J. Early influences on development: Fact or fancy? Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1975, 21, 267-294.

Schaefer, E. S. Parents as educators: Evidence from cross-sectional, longitudinal and intervention research. Young Children, 1972, 27, 227-239.

Schooler, C. Birth order effects: Not here, not now! Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 78, 161-175.

Seitz, V., Apfel, N. H., & Efron, C. Long-term effects of intervention: A longitudinal investigation. Paper presented at meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September, 1976.

Shipman, V. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Structure and development of cognitive competencies and styles prior to school entry (PR 71-19). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 496)

Shipman, V. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Demographic indexes of socioeconomic status and maternal behaviors and attitudes (PR 72-13). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972 (a). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 522)

Shipman, V. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Structural stability and change in the test performance of urban preschool children (PR 72-18). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972 (b). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 011)

Shipman, V. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Interim report (PR 73-35). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Shipman, V. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Notable early characteristics of high and low achieving black low-SES children (PR 76-21). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Slaughter, D. T. Relation of early parent-teacher socialization influences to achievement orientation and self-esteem in middle childhood among low-income black children. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, Col., April 1975.

Solomon, D., Hirsch, J. G., Scheinfeld, D. K., & Jackson, J. C. Family characteristics and elementary school achievement in an urban ghetto. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 462-466.

Stricker, L. Dimensions of social stratification for whites and blacks: The Toledo Study (RB 76-30). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, November 1976.

Tulkin, S. Race, class, family, and social achievement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 31-37.

U. S. Department of Labor. Handbook of labor statistics--1975. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Walker, D., Bane, M. J., & Bryk, T. The quality of the Head Start planned variation data. Prepared under Grant H-1926, Office of Child Development. Cambridge, Mass.: Huron Institute, 1973.

Ward, W. C. Disadvantaged children and their first school experiences: Development of self-regulatory behaviors (PR 73-18). Prepared under Grant H-8256, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 414)

Wasserman, H. L. A comparative study of school performance among boys from broken and intact black families. Journal of Negro Education, 1972, 41, 137-141.

White, B. L. Critical influences in the origins of competence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1975, 21, 243-265.

White, S. H., Day, M. C., Freeman, P. K., Hantman, S. A., & Messenger, K. P. Federal programs for young children: Review and recommendations. Vol. III: Recommendations for federal program planning. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Publication No. OS 74-103. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Wolf, R. M. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1964.

Wright, J. D., & Wright, S. R. Social class and parental values for children: A partial replication and extension of the Kohn Thesis. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 527-537.

Zajonc, R. B. Family configuration and intelligence. Science, 1976, 192, 227-236.

Zigler, E. F. Learning, development and social class in the socialization process. In M. H. Marx (Ed.), Learning: Interactions. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

APPENDIX A

Year 6 Parent Interview

1. General Interview Instructions
2. Parent Interview

PARENT INTERVIEW

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Spring, 1974

YOUNG CHILDREN AND THEIR FIRST SCHOOL EXPERIENCES
A LONGITUDINAL STUDY

MATERIALS

You will need the following materials:

1. Interviewer Instructions
2. Questionnaires
3. Ladder card

INTERVIEWING PROCEDURES

The following procedures are designed to aid you in successfully completing your interviewing task. Study them carefully and refer to them from time to time throughout the course of the study.

A. Carefully study this instruction booklet and the questionnaire. Do not hesitate to ask your supervisor questions about anything you have seen or read.

B. Follow all instructions contained in this booklet, the questionnaire, or given by your supervisor exactly.

C. At all times maintain a relaxed and friendly appearance to respondents.

D. Dress comfortably, but neatly. You are not to dress in a way that will give the respondent the feeling that you come from another world or society than she does.

E. Do not impose yourself on the respondent. Smoke only if the respondent says it is okay.

F. You should have a comfortable and private place for interviewing.

G. While conducting the interview, always refer to the child by his or her name. In addition, when you see "HIS/HER", read the one term which applies.

H. Read each question exactly as written.

I. Try to get the respondent to answer every question but do not force or trick her into answering questions she does not want to answer.

J. Maintain control over the interviews. Keep questioning flowing smoothly and do your best to avoid miscellaneous comments or discussions. Make sure that you do not skip questions.

K. Maintain a neutral attitude towards the respondent's answers, attitudes or comments. Do not appear to take a personal interest in any of her statements. Do not agree or disagree with anything she says. Be understanding and sympathetic, but neutral.

L. Do not put words into the respondent's mouth. Wait for her to speak.

M. Some statements you can use to aid you in getting answers to questions are:

1. "There aren't any right or wrong answers to these questions."
2. "Remember your answer to these questions is being held in the strictest confidence; they will never, in any way, be identified with you."
3. "This study is designed to aid all children (including your own) in this community and throughout the country."
4. "Many people always complain that no one listens to what they have to say. Here is your chance to speak up and be heard."

N. All information obtained in this interview is confidential. Under no circumstances are you to divulge information from or on this study to any source. If anyone questions you concerning the information, refer this person directly to your supervisor.

O. Before saying "goodbye" to the respondent, quickly scan the interview to check that no questions have been skipped.

P. Go over all questionnaires the same day you complete them. If any questions have been skipped, try to visit or call the respondent either that day or the next day to get her answer. Be sure to explain that you forgot to ask the question.

Q. In the case of the parent having more than one child in the study, use additional interview forms and fill out separate cover sheets but ask only the questions listed below for the other child(ren).

Question(s):
1 thru 100
123 thru 128
157c
168
205 thru 212
231 thru 232
236 thru 238
249 thru 251
262 thru 264
275b
276 thru 295

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was designed to make it easy for you, the interviewer, to work with, ask and record answers to all the questions.

A. Booklet Form:

You will note that the questionnaire is in booklet form. You will be able, while interviewing, in most cases, to fold the booklet back so that only the page you are using need be in front of you. In one or two cases a question may stretch over two pages and then you may find it best to keep the two pages exposed by opening up the booklet.

B. Question Forms:

There are four different question forms in this questionnaire. Each form of question has one and only one way in which the answer can be recorded:

The question forms are:

1. Questions where you are given a choice of several answers and are asked to check one or more of them.

An example of this kind of question would be the following:

24. WHERE DOES (CHILD'S NAME) PLAY MOST OF THE TIME? (Check one)

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Inside the house
____ 2. Around his/her own house
____ 3. Around someone else's house
____ 4. On a playground
____ 5. Other (Specify) ________________________
____ 9. Don't know

In this sample (taken directly from the questionnaire) you are asked to listen to the respondent and check the answer which best fits the answer she gives you. If her answer is something other than the choices given, you are to put a check mark next to "5. Other" and write her answer in on the line provided. In these questions very often you will find this choice of "Other (Specify)" which will be used for writing in any answers which do not fit into the choices you are given.

It is important not to read the choices for these questions unless you are specifically told to do so on the questionnaire.

2. Questions where you will find no choices to check off.

You will find, instead, one or more printed lines. In these cases you are to write down the answer the respondent gives you verbatim (word for word exactly as she says it) as if you were a tape recorder.

An example from the questionnaire of this type of question would be the following:

55. EVERY CHILD HAS STRONG POINTS AND WEAK POINTS. SOME CHILDREN ARE ABLE TO DO THINGS THAT MOST OTHER CHILDREN CAN'T DO. WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT YOUR CHILD CAN DO ESPECIALLY WELL? (Probe: ANY OTHERS?)

A probe is a neutral way of getting a further response to a question. The probe you are to use is on the questionnaire. In this case it is "ANY OTHERS?" When recording the answer indicate the difference between the original response and the probed response by placing a large "Q" between the two. Thus, if the answer to the question is "He goes to the store" and to your probe of "any other" she says "He brushes his teeth," you would record as follows:

He goes to the store. Q. He brushes his teeth.

If at any time in giving a response to this type of question, the respondent changes the subject (goes off the track), try to get her back on the subject. Indicate this fact by a slash mark (/) at the point in the response where she wanders. It is not necessary to record what she says off the subject.

3. Questions where a certain answer qualified the respondent to be asked one or more special questions that are not asked of all respondents. The qualifying answer(s) and the special question(s) are set off in a "block" to aid you in following the format.

An example of a blocked question is:

146a. IN THE PAST, WAS THERE ANYTHING AROUND HERE WHICH YOU WANTED CHANGED OR IMPROVED?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

146b. WHAT WAS IT?____________________

146c. DID THE CHANGE OR IMPROVEMENT OCCUR?
____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

In the sample a "yes" answer to question 146a would mean that you should ask questions 146b and 146c. If the answer was "no" to question 146a, you would SKIP questions 146b and 146c and go straight to Q. 147a. Bear in mind that it is possible to find a block within a block.

4. Grid Questions.

A grid question is used when it was felt that it would be easier for you to have a series of questions or answers on the same page because of their similarity in recording. This is often done to save you the necessity of having to read the same question many times. The one thing to bear in mind about grid questions is that instead of writing answers right next to questions you will be checking "boxes" or filling in lines in a large grid. Some examples of grid questions found in your questionnaire are Q. 34, 47, 90, 150 and 186. Glance at them to familiarize yourself with the form. Note that a grid question can require both open-end and closed-end questions.

C. Printing on Questionnaires:

To aid you in using the questionnaire we have used 2 kinds of printing. Each type of printing has a different meaning. The types of printing are:

1. CAPTIAL LETTERS: EVERYTHING TYPED IN ALL CAPITAL LETTERS DESIGNATES QUESTIONS OR STATEMENTS TO BE READ TO THE RESPONDENT.
2. Regular Printing: This is printing as you normally see it in books, magazines and newspapers. It uses both capital and lower case letters. Everything typed this way designates special instructions to you. Words or statements printed in this manner are designated to aid you and are not to be read.

D. "(Skip to Q. _____.)"

Many times in the questionnaire you will see words "(Skip to Q. _____.)" next to a particular answer or within a block. This notation means that if this special answer is given you are to skip directly to the question indicated and not ask all the questions between.

If "Skip to Q. ____." is found in a block it means that after you ask all the questions in the block you are to skip to the question indicated.

E. Refusals and "Don't Know" and "Did not understand":

In many questions on the questionnaire "Don't know" has been provided for checking off as a possible response. If the respondent does not know the answer to a given question and "Don't know" has not been indicated, write in "D.K."

It is also possible for a respondent to refuse to answer a question for one reason or another. If this happens, check the "No response" space or write "Ref." in the area provided for an answer. If she tells you why she is refusing, make a note of it.

If the respondent does not understand any particular question (after you have re-read the question one or two times), write "did not understand Q." in the space provided for the answer.

Note: Questions the respondent does not answer or which are not applicable are usually coded 0. There must be a written indication that the question was not overlooked. Blanks will indicate only a failure or omission on the interviewer's part.

F. Notes on Questionnaire:

You are to feel free to note directly on the questionnaire any observation or unusual occurrences during the interview. The left-hand margin on each page is not to be used for notes since this margin will be used later for coding. Comments or observations can be written anywhere else on the questionnaire or on additional pages. If a particular question is being referred to, be sure to note its number.

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Child's Name: ____

PARENT INTERVIEW (Spring 1974)

ID #: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _   Interviewer ID #: _ _ _   Date: _ _/_ _/7 4

Time Begun: ________   Time Ended: ________

Respondent's Full Name: ____

ARE YOU THE ONE RESPONSIBLE FOR CARING FOR (CHILD'S NAME)? ____Yes (Continue interview)

____No (Stop interview)

DO YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE CHILD IN THE STUDY?

____Yes   WHAT ARE THEIR NAMES?

____No

________________________________ ID #: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

________________________________ ID #: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

WHAT IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO (CHILD'S NAME)? (Check one.)

- _____ Mother
- _____ Stepmother
- _____ Female, relative (Specify) ________________________________
- _____ Female, non-relative (Specify) ____________________________
- _____ Male caretaker (Specify) __________________________________

Racial Ethnic Group (Check appropriate boxes)

	Black	White	Other (Specify)
Sample Child	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] ____________________
Respondent	[ ]	[ ]	[ ] ____________________

YOUNG CHILDREN AND THEIR FIRST SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

PARENT INTERVIEW III (Spring 1974)

Part I: School Experience

FIRST I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT (CHILD'S NAME).

1. DID (CHILD'S NAME) EVER GO TO A NURSERY SCHOOL, HEAD START OR OTHER PROGRAM FOR GROUPS OF CHILDREN BEFORE ATTENDING REGULAR SCHOOL?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No (Skip to Question 4.)
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

WHERE? ____________________
WHEN? ____________________
ANY OTHERS? ____________________
WHEN? ____________________

(Code later; check all appropriate.)

____1. Summer '69 Head Start
____2. Full Year Head Start '68-'69
____3. Full Year Head Start '69-'70
____4. Full Year Head Start '70-'71
____5. Day Care Center '68-'69
____6. Day Care Center '69-'70
____7. University Nursery School '68-'69
____8. University Nursery School '69-'70
____9. Church sponsored Nursery School '68-'69
____10. Church sponsored Nursery School '69-'70
____11. Other (Specify) ____________________
____
____

2. LOOKING BACK, WHAT DO YOU THINK WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING THE (HEAD START/PRESCHOOL) PROGRAM DID FOR (CHILD'S NAME)?

____
____
____

3. WHAT WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING THE (HEAD START/PRESCHOOL) PROGRAM DID FOR YOU?

____
____
____

4. DID HE/SHE ATTEND A KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM?

____ 1. Yes
WHERE? ______________________________

WHEN? ______________________________

(Code later)

____ 1. Public School kindergarten
____ 2. Private kindergarten
____ 3. Head Start kindergarten
____ 4. Other (Specify) ______________________________
____

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

5a. WHAT GRADE IS (CHILD'S NAME) IN NOW?

____ 1. Second

____ 2. Third

____ 3. Fourth

____ 4. Other (Specify) ______________________________

5b. (If child is not in third grade, and respondent did not supply reason ask: SHOULD (CHILD'S NAME) BE IN THIRD GRADE NOW?)

____

____

5c. (If child was held back, and answer to above question did not specify reason, ask: WHY DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) WAS HELD BACK?)

____

____

6a. IS (CHILD'S NAME) IN A FOLLOW THROUGH CLASSROOM OR SOME OTHER KIND OF SPECIAL PROGRAM OR CLASS?

____ 1. Yes
6b. WHAT KIND?
____ 1. Follow Through
____ 2. Special class (Specify) ______________________________
____

____ 9. Can't tell; don't know

6c. WHY WAS HE/SHE PLACED THERE?

____

____

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

7. DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) IS DOING MUCH BETTER, SOMEWHAT BETTER, AS WELL AS, NOT QUITE AS WELL AS, OR MUCH POORER IN SCHOOL THAN MOST CHILDREN HIS/HER AGE? (Point to appropriate stick figures on card.)

____ 1. Much better
____ 2. Somewhat better
____ 3. As well as
____ 4. Not quite as well as
____ 5. Much poorer
____ 9. Can't say; don't know
____ 0. No response

8. DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) HAS FEWER PROBLEMS, ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER OF PROBLEMS, OR MORE PROBLEMS LEARNING TO READ THAN MOST CHILDREN HIS/HER AGE?

____ 1. Fewer
____ 2. About the same
____ 3. More
____ 9. Can't say; don't know
____ 0. No response

9. HOW HARD DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) TRIES TO DO WELL IN HIS/HER SCHOOLWORK?

____ 1. Very hard
____ 2. About average
____ 3. Not hard at all
____ 9. Can't tell; don't know
____ 0. No response

10. WHAT IS (CHILD'S NAME) TEACHER'S NAME? (If child has more than one regular academic area teacher, ask for reading teacher's name.)

____

11. HOW GOOD A JOB DO YOU THINK HIS/HER TEACHER HAS DONE IN TEACHING (CHILD'S NAME) THIS YEAR -- VERY GOOD, PRETTY GOOD, NOT SO GOOD, OR NOT GOOD AT ALL?

____ 1. Very good
____ 2. Pretty good
____ 3. Not so good
____ 4. Not good at all
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

12a. DO YOU THINK THERE'S ENOUGH OPPORTUNITY FOR YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN AND LEARN ABOUT (CHILD'S NAME) LIFE IN SCHOOL?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Can't tell; don't know
____ 0. No response

12b. (If child attended preschool/Head Start ask: DO YOU HAVE MORE, LESS, OR ABOUT THE SAME OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT NOW AS WHEN (CHILD'S NAME) WAS IN PRESCHOOL?)

____ 1. More
____ 2. Less
____ 3. About the same
____ 9. Can't tell; don't know
____ 0. No response

HOW MANY TIMES THIS SCHOOL YEAR HAVE YOU GONE TO (CHILD'S NAME) SCHOOL FOR THE FOLLOWING THINGS:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Other (Specify)
13. PTA MEETINGS							
14. PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE							
15. SPECIAL PROGRAMS, e.g., CHRISTMAS PLAY							
16. TO HELP OUT IN (CHILD'S NAME) CLASSROOM							
17. TO HELP WITH FIELD TRIPS OR PARTIES							
18. OTHER (Specify) ____________________							
____________________							
19. TO TALK WITH (CHILD'S NAME) TEACHER ABOUT (CHILD'S NAME) (If answered Yes, ask: WHO REQUESTED THE MEETING?)____________________							

20a. WERE THERE ANY MEETINGS ABOUT THE CLASS PROGRAM FOR PARENTS THIS YEAR?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

20b. DID YOU ATTEND ANY OF THESE MEETINGS?

____ No response (Skip to Question 21)

____ No (Skip to Question 21)

____ Yes

20c. HOW MANY TIMES DID YOU ATTEND?

____ 0. No response to question; don't know

____ 1. No, did not attend

____ 2. Yes, 1 or 2 times

____ 3. Yes, 3 or 4 times

____ 4. Yes, 5 or 6 times

____ 5. Yes, 7 or 8 times

____ 6. Yes, 9 or more times

21a. IS THERE A PARENTS' COUNCIL OR PARENTS' ADVISORY GROUP?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

21b. ABOUT HOW MANY MEETINGS OF THIS GROUP HAVE YOU ATTENDED?

____ 0. No response; don't know
____ 1. No, there was no parents' council
____ 2. No, was not member of council
____ 3. Yes, 1 or 2 times
____ 4. Yes, 3 or 4 times
____ 5. Yes, 5 or 6 times
____ 6. Yes, 7 or 8 times
____ 7. Yes, 9 or 10 times
____ 8. Yes, 11 or 12 times
____ 9. Yes, 13 or more times

22. DID YOU HELP MAKE ANY DECISIONS ABOUT THE CLASS PROGRAM THIS YEAR?

____ 0. No response

____ 1. No. WHY NOT? ____

____ 2. Yes. GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE. ____

____ 9. Don't know

Part II: Child Behavior

23a. WHAT DOES (CHILD'S NAME) LIKE TO DO THE MOST? ____

23b. (If not answered in response to above question, ask: WHAT DOES (CHILD'S NAME) LIKE TO PLAY WITH MOST? If more than one mentioned, ask: WHICH ONE MOST? and circle.)

24. WHERE DOES (CHILD'S NAME) PLAY MOST OF THE TIME? (If more than one response given, repeat question and circle final choice.)

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Inside the house

____ 2. Around his/her own house

____ 3. Around someone else's house

____ 4. On a playground

____ 5. Other (Specify) ____

____ 9. Don't know

25. ABOUT HOW MANY HOURS PER DAY, WHEN HE/SHE IS AWAKE, IS (CHILD'S NAME) USUALLY WITH YOU DURING THE WEEKDAYS AND DURING THE WEEKEND? (If answer is "All day," ask: AND HOW MANY HOURS IS THAT?)

WEEKDAYS: ______________________________

WEEKEND: ______________________________

26. DURING THE TIME HE/SHE IS WITH YOU, WHAT ARE YOU USUALLY DOING?

____

____

NOW I'D LIKE TO HAVE YOU RATE (CHILD'S NAME) ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

(Read response choices 1-4 for each item.)

	Very much/good 1	Pretty much/good 2	Not so much/good 3	Not at all 4	Don't know 9	No Resp. 0
27. GENERALLY SPEAKING, HOW WOULD YOU RATE (CHILD'S NAME) OVERALL INDEPENDENCE?						
28. HOW HARD DO YOU FEEL (CHILD'S NAME) TRIES TO DO WELL OR WIN IN SPORTS OR GAMES?						
29. HOW POPULAR IS HE/SHE WITH OTHER CHILDREN HIS/HER OWN AGE?						
30. HOW WELL DOES (CHILD'S NAME) DO IN SPORTS OR GAMES?						
31. HOW MUCH LEADERSHIP DOES (CHILD'S NAME) SHOW WITH OTHER CHILDREN HIS/HER AGE? THAT IS, ORGANIZING OR SUGGESTING GAMES OR PROJECTS?						
32. HOW WELL IS (CHILD'S NAME) ABLE TO KEEP HIS/HER MIND ON WHAT HE/SHE IS DOING UNTIL HE/SHE FINISHES SOMETHING YOU ASK HIM/HER TO DO?						
33. HOW ABLE IS (CHILD'NAME) AT GETTING GROWNUPS TO HELP HIM/HER IF HE/SHE DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO DO SOMETHING?						

COMPARING (CHILD'S NAME) WITH MOST CHILDREN HIS/HER AGE, I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME IF HE/SHE:

(INTERVIEWER: Read each item. If difficulty is experienced in obtaining answers specified, say: IT IS IMPORTANT IN YOUR ANSWERS TO BEAR IN MIND THAT EVEN IF YOU FEEL THAT YOUR CHILD IS "AVERAGE" OR "LIKE OTHER CHILDREN IN GENERAL" IT IS POSSIBLE TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION "YES" OR "NO." If response is "No" ask: LIKE MOST CHILDREN (or POORER, YOUNGER, etc.) as appropriate to question. If response is "In some things" ask respondent to specify.)

	Yes	No Average	No Opposite	In Some Things (Specify)	Don't Know
34. SPEAKS BETTER THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
35. ACTS OLDER THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
36. IS HAPPIER THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
37. CRIES MORE THAN OTHER CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
38. IS EASIER TO GET ALONG WITH THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
39. HAS MORE TEMPER TANTRUMS THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
40. ACTS YOUNGER THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
41. ASKS MORE QUESTIONS THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
42. STAYS BY HIMSELF MORE THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
43. IS MORE ACTIVE THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐
44. IS AFRAID OF MORE THINGS THAN MOST CHILDREN (HIS/HER AGE)	☐	☐	☐	________	☐

45. WHEN (CHILD'S NAME) WENT TO FIRST GRADE, DID YOU THINK HE/SHE HAD MORE OR FEWER PROBLEMS THAN MOST CHILDREN GETTING USED TO SCHOOL?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Fewer
____ 2. About average
____ 3. More
____ 9. Don't know

46. WHAT IS (CHILD'S NAME) MOST LIKELY TO DO WHEN HE/SHE HAS TO BE WITH SOMEBODY HE/SHE DOESN'T KNOW WELL? (Read response choices 1-4.)

____ 1. BE RELAXED
____ 2. BE SHY AND QUIET
____ 3. BE MAD OR ANGRY, BUT NOT SHOW IT
____ 4. GET MAD OR ANGRY, AND SHOW IT
____ 5. Other (Specify) ________________________________
____ 9. Don't know; can't tell
____ 0. No response

HOW OFTEN WOULD (CHILD'S NAME) BE LIKELY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSIONS? (Read response choices.)

	Very often	Some-times	Once in awhile	Never	No response
47. DISCUSSION ABOUT HOW OFTEN (CHILD'S NAME) CAN WATCH TV.					
48. DISCUSSION ABOUT HOW (CHILD'S NAME) WILL SPEND MONEY HE/SHE HAS BEEN GIVEN.					
49. DISCUSSION ABOUT CHILDREN HE/SHE PLAYS WITH					
50. CHOICE OF CLOTHES TO WEAR TO SCHOOL					
51. DECISION ON WHAT TIME (CHILD'S NAME) SHOULD GO TO BED.					

52. WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF (CHILD'S NAME) ASKED A QUESTION THAT YOU DIDN'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO? (If response is "This never happens," probe: WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF THIS DID HAPPEN? If response is "I don't know," probe: YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'D SAY TO (CHILD'S NAME)?)

53a. THINK ABOUT THE LAST TIME (CHILD'S NAME) DID SOMETHING THAT PLEASED YOU A GREAT DEAL. WHAT WAS IT? (Probe for specific incident.)

53b. WHAT DID YOU DO? (Probe for specific behavior if possible.)

54a. THINK ABOUT THE LAST TIME (CHILD'S NAME) DID SOMETHING THAT REALLY MADE YOU ANGRY. WHAT WAS IT? (Probe for specific incident.)

54b. WHAT DID YOU DO? (Probe for specific behavior if possible.)

55. EVERY CHILD HAS STRONG POINTS AND WEAK POINTS. SOME CHILDREN ARE ABLE TO DO THINGS THAT MOST OTHER CHILDREN CAN'T DO. WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT YOUR CHILD CAN DO ESPECIALLY WELL? (Probe: ANY OTHERS?)

56. WHAT ARE THE THINGS THAT HE/SHE CAN'T DO WELL? (Probe: ANY OTHERS?)

AT WHAT AGE DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO THE FOLLOWING THINGS? WHEN DO YOU THINK HE/SHE WILL BE ABLE TO DO THEM WELL?

	Can now do	Age should do	Age should do well	Don't know	No Response
57. STAY IN THE HOUSE ALONE FOR A COUPLE OF HOURS?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
58. SETTLE BY HIMSELF AN ARGUMENT WITH AN OLDER BROTHER OR SISTER, OR OLDER COUSINS?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
59. READ BOOKS ALONE WITHOUT YOUR HELP?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
60. TAKE PART IN YOUR ADULT INTERESTS AND CONVERSATION WITH FRIENDS?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
61. MAKE HIS OWN DINNER?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
62. STAND UP FOR HIS/HER RIGHTS WITH OTHER CHILDREN?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
63. TAKE CARE OF YOUNGER CHILDREN?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
64. GO TO ENTERTAINMENT EVENTS FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC ALONE?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
65. KNOW HOW TO BEHAVE IN COMPANY?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
66. EARN HIS OWN SPENDING MONEY?	☐	____	____	☐	☐
67. **HAVE** REAL HOUSEHOLD CHORES?	☐	____	____	☐	☐

68. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) GET ALONG WELL, ABOUT AVERAGE, OR NOT SO WELL WITH HIS BROTHERS (AND/OR SISTERS)?

____ 1. Gets along well
____ 2. About average
____ 3. Not so well
____ 4. Does not apply, only child
____ 0. No response

69a. DO YOU EVER READ OR TELL CHILDREN'S STORIES TO (CHILD'S NAME)?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No (includes "Seldom" or "Never")

____ 0. No response

69b. DO YOU MAINLY READ OR TELL STORIES, OR DO YOU DO BOTH?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Mainly tell stories
____ 2. Mainly read stories
____ 3. Do both

69c. ABOUT HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THIS? (Check one.)

____ 1. No response
____ 2. Once in awhile (less than once a week)
____ 3. About once a week
____ 4. Several times a week
____ 5. Regularly (at least once a day)
____ 6. Very frequently (much of each day)
____ 9. Don't know

70. DOES ANYONE ELSE IN THE HOUSEHOLD EVER READ TO (CHILD'S NAME)?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

70a. WHO IS THAT? (Check all appropriate.)

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Father
____ 2. Other male adult
____ 3. Female adult
____ 4. Older children
____ 5. Other (Specify) ________________________
____

70b. ABOUT HOW OFTEN IS (CHILD'S NAME) READ TO BY THIS PERSON (THESE PEOPLE) COUNTING ALL THEIR TIME?

____ 1. No response
____ 2. Once in awhile (less than once a week)
____ 3. About once a week
____ 4. Several times a week
____ 5. Regularly (at least once a day)
____ 6. Very frequently (much of each day)
____ 9. Don't know

71. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) EVER READ STORIES TO YOUNGER CHILDREN?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No (includes "Seldom" or "Never")

____ 9. Don't know; can't tell

____ 0. No response

71a. ABOUT HOW OFTEN DOES HE/SHE DO THIS?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Once in awhile (less than once a week)
____ 2. About once a week
____ 3. Several times a week
____ 4. Regularly (at least once a day)
____ 5. Very frequently (much of each day)
____ 9. Don't know

72. APART FROM HIS/HER SCHOOL BOOKS OR COMIC BOOKS, HOW MANY BOOKS DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE FOR HIS/HER VERY OWN? (Probe for number.)

____

73. WHAT ARE SOME OF (CHILD'S NAME) FAVORITE BOOKS OR STORIES?

____ 1. Titles mentioned (Specify) ____

____

____ 9. Don't know

74. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE A PUBLIC LIBRARY CARD OR A BOOKMOBILE CARD?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know; can't tell

____ 0. No response

75. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) BRING HOME LIBRARY BOOKS FROM SCHOOL TO READ?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 0. No response

75a. ABOUT HOW OFTEN (number of times per week or month)?

____

76. **HOW DOES (CHILD'S NAME) FEEL ABOUT GOING TO GRADE SCHOOL? SOME CHILDREN** HIS/HER AGE LIKE TO GO AND SOME DON'T.

____ 0. No response

____ 1. He/She doesn't like it; doesn't want to go

____ 2. He/she sometimes likes it and sometimes doesn't like it.

____ 3. He/she does like it; does want to go

____ 4. Other (Specify) ____

____ 9. Don't know

77. WHAT DOES (CHILD'S NAME) LIKE MOST ABOUT SCHOOL?

____

____

78. WHAT DOES HE/SHE LIKE LEAST ABOUT SCHOOL?

____

____

79a. (If child attended preschool/Head Start, ask:) THINK BACK TO THE TIME HE/SHE WAS IN PRESCHOOL/HEAD START. DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) PRESCHOOL/HEAD START EXPERIENCE HAS AFFECTED HIS/HER ATTITUDE TOWARDS SCHOOL?

____ 1. Yes

79b. HOW? ______________________________

____

____

____

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

80. HOW OFTEN DO YOU HELP/WORK WITH (CHILD'S NAME) WITH HIS/HER HOMEWORK? (times per week) (If responds "no homework," skip to Question 84.)

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Don't usually help him/her (Skip to Question 83.)

____ 2. About once a week

____ 3. About twice a week

____ 4. About three times a week

____ 5. About four times a week

____ 6. About five times a week

____ 7. Other (Specify) ______________________________

81. HOW LONG DID YOU WORK WITH (CHILD'S NAME) YESTERDAY?

____ 1. Specific amount of time ______________________________

____ 9. Don't know ____ Other (Specify) ______________________

____ 0. No response

82. IS THERE A SPECIFIC PLACE OR ROOM IN THE HOUSE THAT YOU USUALLY USE WHEN YOU WORK WITH (CHILD'S NAME) ON HIS/HER HOMEWORK?

____ 1. Yes

82a. WHERE IS THAT? ______________________________

____

____ 2. No

____ 0. No response

83. DO OTHERS IN THE FAMILY HELP HIM/HER WITH HIS/HER HOMEWORK?

____ 1. Yes
83a. WHO? ____________________
83b. HOW OFTEN (number of times per week)? ____________________
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

84. IF YOU COULD HAVE YOUR WISH, WHAT GRADE IN SCHOOL WOULD YOU LIKE (CHILD'S NAME) TO COMPLETE?

____ 00. No response
____ Grade given (Specify) ____________________
____ Other (Specify) ____________________
____ 99. Don't know

85. SINCE THINGS DON'T ALWAYS TURN OUT THE WAY WE WANT THEM TO, HOW FAR DO YOU THINK (CHILD'S NAME) WILL ACTUALLY GO IN SCHOOL?

____ 00. No response
____ Grade given (Specify) ____________________
____ Other (Specify) ____________________
____ 99. Don't know

86. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT COULD PREVENT (CHILD'S NAME) FROM COMPLETING (Insert answer to Question 84)?

____
____
____

87. IF YOU COULD HAVE YOUR WISH, WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE (CHILD'S NAME) TO BE WHEN HE/SHE GROWS UP?

____ 00. No response
____ Job given (Specify) ____________________
____ Other (Specify) ____________________
____ 99. Don't know (Encourage) ____________________

88. SINCE THINGS DON'T ALWAYS TURN OUT THE WAY WE WANT THEM TO, WHAT DO YOU THINK HE/SHE WILL ACTUALLY DO?

____ 00. No response
____ Job given (Specify) ____________________
____ Other (Specify) ____________________
____ 99. Don't know (Encourage) ____________________

89a. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE A HOBBY OR OTHER SPECIAL INTERESTS?

____ 1. Yes

89b. WHAT IS IT? ____________________

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE?

		1. Yes	2. No	9. Don't know	0. No response
90.	Board Games (give example)				
91.	Bicyle				
92.	Blocks or other construction toys				
93.	Paints or magic markers				
94.	Records				
95.	Clay or playdoh				
96.	Musical instruments (toy or real)				
97.	Science kit				
98.	Child's dictionary or encyclopedia				
99.	Puzzles				

100. DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE ANY SPECIAL FRIENDS?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

100a. List Name(s)	b. In School	c. On Block	d. Age	e. Sex
1.				
2.				
3.				

Part III: Education and Schools

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT EDUCATION IN GENERAL, AND ABOUT THE SCHOOLS IN THIS AREA.

101. PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT WHAT STUDENTS ARE LIKE IN GRADE SCHOOL. WHAT IS YOUR IDEA OF A GOOD STUDENT?

102. PEOPLE ALSO HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT WHAT TEACHERS ARE LIKE IN GRADE SCHOOL. WHAT IS YOUR IDEA OF A GOOD TEACHER? (If name given, probe for characteristics.)

103. DO YOU FEEL THAT, IN THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD GOES TO, MOST TEACHERS DO AS MUCH AS THEY CAN TO TEACH ALL CHILDREN, NOT AS MUCH AS THEY CAN, OR VERY MUCH LESS THAN THEY CAN?

____ 0. No response

____ 1. As much as they can

____ 2. Not as much as they can

____ 3. Very much less than they can

____ 9. Don't know

104. DO YOU THINK THE BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE SCHOOLS THAT YOUR CHILD GOES TO ARE AS GOOD AS OR BETTER THAN THOSE IN MOST OTHER SCHOOLS IN THE CITY OR DO YOU THINK THE BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT ARE WORSE HERE? (Check one.)

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Better than most other schools

____ 2. As good as most other schools

____ 3. Worse than most other schools

____ 9. Don't know

105. DO YOU THINK THAT MOST TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL THAT YOUR CHILD GOES TO ARE AS GOOD AS OR BETTER THAN THOSE IN MOST OTHER SCHOOLS IN THE CITY OR DO YOU THINK THAT MOST TEACHERS ARE WORSE HERE? (Check one.)

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Better than most other teachers

____ 2. As good as most other teachers

____ 3. Worse than most other teachers

____ 9. Don't know

106a. DO YOU THINK THE SCHOOLS WOULD BE BETTER OR WORSE IF PARENTS HAD MORE CONTROL OVER THEM? (the schools)

____ 1. Better

106 b. WHAT KINDS OF CONTROL DO YOU HAVE IN MIND? ____________________

____ 2. Worse

____ 3. About the same

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

107. HOW MANY OF THE TEACHERS DO YOU THINK UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEMS FACED BY THE PEOPLE IN THIS AREA? WOULD YOU SAY THAT (read response categories 1-4).

____ 1. MOST OF THE TEACHERS UNDERSTAND?

____ 2. SOME OF THE TEACHERS UNDERSTAND?

____ 3. HARDLY ANY OF THE TEACHERS UNDERSTAND?

____ 4. NONE OF THE TEACHERS UNDERSTAND?

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

108a. DO YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE THINGS YOU CAN DO TO IMPROVE THE SCHOOLS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD? (Read response categories 1-3.)

____ 1. YES, MANY THINGS

____ 2. YES, SOME THINGS

108b. WHAT CAN YOU DO? ____________________

____ 3. NO, NONE AT ALL

108c. WHY IS THERE NOTHING YOU CAN DO? ____________________

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

109. HOW MANY OF THE CLASSROOMS IN YOUR DISTRICT WOULD YOU SAY ARE OVERCROWDED? WOULD YOU SAY THAT ALL, MOST, SOME, FEW OR NONE ARE OVERCROWDED?

____ 0. No response

____ 1. All

____ 2. Most

____ 3. Some

____ 4. Few

____ 5. None

____ 9. Don't know

110. DO YOU THINK THAT MOST TEACHERS REALLY WANT TO TALK WITH PARENTS ABOUT SCHOOL?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

111. DO YOU THINK IT'S OKAY FOR PARENTS TO KEEP THEIR CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL TO HELP AT HOME ONCE IN A WHILE?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

112. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THINGS AND PEOPLE THAT MIGHT BE BLAMED WHEN CHILDREN DO NOT WORK HARD OR DO NOT DO WELL IN SCHOOL. WHICH OF THESE, PARENTS, CHILDREN, THE WAY THE SCHOOL IS RUN, TEACHERS, BAD EXAMPLES FROM OTHER CHILDREN, OR OTHER FACTORS, WOULD YOU SAY IS MOST TO BLAME FOR CHILDREN NOT DOING WELL IN SCHOOL? WHO OR WHAT DO YOU THINK IS MOST TO BLAME? AND NEXT? (Record 1 for most, 2 for next, in appropriate space.)

____1. Parents
____2. Children
____3. Way school is run
____4. Teachers
____5. Bad examples
____6. Other (Specify) ________________________________
____7. All equally to blame (probe for most) ____________________
____9. Don't know
____0. No response

113a. DO YOU THINK THAT ANYONE WHO CAN DO THE WORK CAN GO TO COLLEGE IF HE WANTS TO?

____1. No
____2. Yes
____9. Don't know
____0. No response

113b. WHY? ________________________________
____
____
____

114a. DO YOU THINK THAT IF YOUR CHILD WENT TO COLLEGE AND GRADUATED, HE WOULD GET AS GOOD A JOB OR INCOME AS THE OTHER GRADUATES?

____ 1. No
____ 2. Yes
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

114b. WHY DO YOU SAY THAT? ____________________
____
____
____

115a. IF YOU DISAGREE WITH THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL, DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU CAN DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT? MOST OF THE TIME, SOME OF THE TIME, NOT AT ALL?

____ 1. Not at all

115b. WHY DO YOU FEEL YOU CANNOT DO ANYTHING?

____
____
____
____

____ 2. Some of the time
____ 3. Most of the time
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

116. DO YOU FEEL THAT MOST CHILDREN HAVE TO BE MADE TO LEARN?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 3. In some things (Specify) ____________________
____ 9. Don't know

DOES YOUR CHILD'S SCHOOL PROVIDE ANY SERVICES BESIDES EDUCATION FOR THE CHILDREN? FOR EXAMPLE, DO THEY PROVIDE:

117a. MEDICAL SERVICES:

____ 1. Yes

117b. WHAT ARE THEY?

____
____
____

____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

118a. EDUCATION FOR ADULTS?

____ 1. Yes

118b. WHAT KIND OF ADULT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES DO THEY HAVE?

____
____
____

____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

119a. HAVE YOU HAD A CHANCE TO TAKE PART IN ANY OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS?

____ 1. Yes

119b. WHICH ONES? ____________________
____
____
____

____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

Part IV: Community

NOW I'M GOING TO ASK ABOUT SOME PROBLEMS THAT COME UP IN EVERYDAY LIFE.

120a. HAVE YOU HAD TO (DID YOU NEED TO) CONTACT ANYONE ABOUT EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE LAST YEAR?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

120b. WHO? WHAT ORGANIZATION?

____

____

120c. WAS THE PROBLEM TAKEN CARE OF?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

____ Other (Specify) ____________________

121a. HAVE YOU HAD TO CONTACT ANYONE ABOUT LEGAL PROBLEMS IN THE LAST YEAR?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

121b. WHO? WHAT ORGANIZATION?

____

____

121c. WAS THE PROBLEM TAKEN CARE OF?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

____ Other (Specify) ____________________

122a. HAVE YOU HAD TO CONTACT ANYONE ABOUT JOB PROBLEMS OR FOR HELP FINDING A JOB IN THE LAST YEAR?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 9. Don't know

____ 0. No response

122b. WHO? WHAT ORGANIZATION?

____

____

122c. WAS THE PROBLEM TAKEN CARE OF?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

____ Other (Specify) ____________________

123. THINKING ABOUT (CHILD'S NAME), DOES HE/SHE HAVE ANY SPECIAL PROBLEMS THAT WORRY YOU?

____ 1. Yes (Specify) ____________________

____ 2. No

____ 0. No response

124a. HAS (CHILD'S NAME) BEEN TO THE DOCTOR IN THE PAST THREE YEARS?

____ 1. Yes
124b. HOW MANY TIMES?
____
____ 2. No
____ 0. No response

125a. HAS HE/SHE HAD ANY SERIOUS ILLNESSES OR ACCIDENTS IN THE LAST THREE YEARS?

____ 1. Yes
125b. WHAT WERE THESE?
____
____
____ 2. No
____ 0. No response

126. IF (CHILD'S NAME) WERE TO BECOME ILL, WHAT WOULD YOU DO OR WHERE WOULD YOU TAKE HIM (need specific name of doctor, clinic, hospital or relationship of person mentioned)?

____

127a. ARE (CHILD'S NAME) TEETH OK?

____ 1. No
127b. WHAT IS THE MATTER? ________________________
____
____
____
____ 2. Yes
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

128a. HAS (CHILD'S NAME) BEEN TO SEE THE DENTIST THIS YEAR?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No (but has appointment)
____ 3. No (but will)
____ 4. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

128b. HOW ABOUT LAST YEAR?
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

129a. DOES ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAVE A SERIOUS ILLNESS, IMPAIRMENT OR CHRONIC CONDITION (e.g., Diabetes, T.B., etc.)?

____1. Yes

____2. No

____0. No response

129b. WHO?____________________

129c. WHAT?____________________

129d. IS IT BEING TREATED?____________________

I'M GOING TO READ A LIST OF THINGS THAT MAY BE AVAILABLE TO CHILDREN IN A PARTICULAR AREA. LISTEN TO EACH AND TELL ME IF IT IS AVAILABLE TO YOUR CHILD(REN) IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, IN THE GENERAL AREA BUT NOT IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, OR NOT AVAILABLE AT ALL. (For Lee County consider up to 10 miles in the general area.)

		In Neighborhood	In General Area	Not Available	Don't Know
130.	NURSERY SCHOOL OR DAY-CARE CENTER	☐	☐	☐	☐
131.	CLINIC	☐	☐	☐	☐
132.	HOSPITAL	☐	☐	☐	☐
133.	SUMMER DAY-CAMP	☐	☐	☐	☐
134.	AFTER HOUR SCHOOL-LED PROGRAMS	☐	☐	☐	☐
135.	TEEN CENTER	☐	☐	☐	☐
136.	PUBLIC LIBRARY	☐	☐	☐	☐
137.	PUBLIC PLAYGROUND (WITH EQUIPMENT AND SPACE FOR CHILDREN OF ALL AGES	☐	☐	☐	☐
138.	PUBLIC PARK FOR ADULTS AND CHILDREN	☐	☐	☐	☐
139.	ART GALLERY	☐	☐	☐	☐
140.	MUSEUM (SCIENCE, HISTORY, ART OR OTHER	☐	☐	☐	☐
*141.	LIVE THEATER (WHERE PLAYS, PUPPET SHOWS ARE GIVEN)	☐	☐	☐	☐
*142.	AUDITORIUM WHERE MUSIC OR SPEECHES CAN BE HEARD	☐	☐	☐	☐
143.	ZOO	☐	☐	☐	☐

*Does not include school.

144a. HAVE YOU EVER VOTED IN A NATIONAL ELECTION?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No (Ask 144c)

____ 0. No response

144b. DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1972 ELECTION (THE ONE BETWEEN McGOVERN AND NIXON)?

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

144c. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE?

____ 0. No response

____ 2. No

____ 1. Yes (Ask: WHAT?)

____

____

____

____

144d. DID YOU VOTE THIS PAST NOVEMBER? (Do not ask in Lee County or Portland.)

____ 0. No response

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

144e. WAS THERE ANY PARTICULAR REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T VOTE?

____ 0. No response

____ 2. No

____ 1. Yes (Ask: WHAT?)

____

____

____

145a. ARE THERE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD GET TOGETHER WITH YOUR NEIGHBORS TO CHANGE HERE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD OR IN THE SCHOOLS?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

____ 0. No response

____ 9. Don't know; can't say

145b. WHAT ARE SOME OF THESE THINGS?

____

____

____

145c. IF A GROUP CAME TOGETHER, DO YOU THINK THE GROUP CERTAINLY COULD, PROBABLY COULD, PROBABLY COULD NOT, OR CERTAINLY COULD NOT GET THE CHANGES MADE?

____ 1. Certainly could
____ 2. Probably could
____ 3. Probably could not
____ 4. Certainly could not
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

146a. IN THE PAST, WAS THERE ANYTHING AROUND HERE WHICH YOU WANTED CHANGED OR IMPROVED?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

146b. WHAT WAS IT? ____________________
____
____

146c. DID THE CHANGE OR IMPROVEMENT OCCUR?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know

147a. IS ANYONE OR ANY GROUP IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAVING ANY SUCCESS IN GETTING THINGS DONE THAT WOULD MAKE THIS A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

147b. I GUESS YOU HAVE SOME PERSON OR ORGANIZATION IN MIND. WOULD YOU MIND TELLING ME WHO IT IS? (If person mentioned, probe for job title.)

____

148a. IF YOU HAD A FRIEND WHO LIVED IN ANOTHER CITY, AND HE ASKED YOU FOR YOUR ADVICE, WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THAT HE MOVE TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

148b. WHY? ____________________
____
____
____

149a. HOW SAFE IS IT FOR (CHILD'S NAME) TO PLAY OUTSIDE OF THE HOUSE?

____ 1. Not safe
____ 2. Safe enough
____ 3. Very safe
____ 9. Don't know
____ 0. No response

149b. WHY NOT? ____________________
____
____
____
____

Part V: Personal

NOW, I'D LIKE TO ASK A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU.

DO YOU NOW BELONG TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING KINDS OF GROUPS?

(INTERVIEWER: Read each type of group and record whether or not respondent belongs. For each type of group respondent belongs to ask:)

A. WHAT ARE THE NAMES OF THE GROUPS TO WHICH YOU BELONG?

B. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USUALLY GO TO MEETINGS OF THIS GROUP?

C. DO YOU HOLD ANY OFFICE IN THIS GROUP OR DO ANYTHING SPECIAL FOR IT?

D. (If "yes" to "C"): WHAT JOB DO YOU DO?

	BELONG		A.
	Yes	No	Names of Groups
150. RELIGIOUS GROUPS OR CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS CHOIR, LADIES AUXILIARY? (Does not include church services.)	☐	☐	
151. CLUBS OR SOCIAL GROUPS SUCH AS WOMEN'S CLUBS, CARD CLUBS OR BOWLING CLUBS?	☐	☐	
152. NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION ASSOCIATED GROUPS SUCH AS COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS, BLOCK GROUPS, PARENTS' COUNCILS?	☐	☐	
153. GROUPS WHICH ARE MAINLY CONNECTED WITH CHILDREN'S EDUCATION SUCH AS PTA, FOLLOW THROUGH?	☐	☐	
154. POLITICAL ACTION GROUPS SUCH AS A POLITICAL PARTY OR CORE, NAACP, SCLS, OR CITIZENS COMMITTEES?	☐	☐	
155. OTHER GROUPS SUCH AS JOB-AFFILIATED GROUPS, UNIONS STUDY GROUPS, ETC.?	☐	☐	

(If respondent belongs to more than one group, ask:)

156a. WHICH GROUP THAT YOU BELONG TO IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?

156b. WHY?

B.	C. Office Holder		D.
Frequency of Attendance	Yes	No	Name of Job
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	
	[ ]	[ ]	

157. DO YOU GO TO CHURCH OR ANOTHER RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 0. No response

157a. WHAT DENOMINATION? ____________________

157b. HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. More than once a week
____ 2. Once a week
____ 3. Once every two weeks
____ 4. Once a month
____ 5. Less than once a month
____ 9. Don't know

157c. DO YOU EVER TAKE (CHILD'S NAME) WITH YOU?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No
____ 0. No response

157d. ABOUT HOW OFTEN?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. More than once a week
____ 2. Once a week
____ 3. Once every two weeks
____ 4. Once a month
____ 5. Less than once a month
____ 9. Don't know

158. ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, ABOUT HOW SATISFIED OR DISSATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE EDUCATION YOU RECEIVED IN SCHOOL? WOULD YOU SAY YOU ARE VERY SATISFIED, SOMEWHAT SATISFIED, SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED, OR VERY DISSATISFIED?

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Very satisfied
____ 2. Somewhat satisfied
____ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied
____ 4. Very dissatisfied
____ 9. Don't know

159. WHAT WAS THE LAST GRADE IN SCHOOL THAT YOU COMPLETED? ____________________

____ 0. No response

____ 9. Don't know

160a. HAVE YOU GONE TO ANY OTHER SCHOOL?

____1. Yes	160b. WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL?____________________ ____________________ 160c. HOW LONG DID YOU GO THERE?____________________ ____________________ 160d. ARE YOU IN SCHOOL AT THE PRESENT TIME? ____0. No response ____1. Yes ____2. No
____2. No ____0. No response	

161a. DO YOU NOW HAVE A PAID JOB?

____ 1. Yes	161b. WHEN DID YOU START WORKING THERE? (Probe for specific month and year.) ____________________
____ 2. No ____ 0. No response	161c. ARE YOU PRESENTLY LOOKING FOR WORK? ____ 0. No response ____ 1. Yes ____ 2. No (Skip to Question 162b.)

HERE IS A PICTURE OF A LADDER. THE BOTTOM STEP, NUMBER 1, REPRESENTS THE WORST JOB, AND THE TOP STEP, NUMBER 10, REPRESENTS THE BEST JOB. (Point to steps on ladder.)

(Ask of those who have jobs.)

162a. PLEASE TELL ME AT WHAT STEP ON THE LADDER YOU WOULD PUT YOUR PRESENT JOB. (Skip to Question 163.)

Number indicated____________________ WHY?____________________

(Ask of those who DO NOT have jobs.)

162b. WHERE WOULD ANY FUTURE JOB YOU MIGHT GET PROBABLY BE ON THE LADDER? (Skip to Question 170a.)

Number indicated____________________ WHY?____________________

163. ARE YOU EMPLOYED FULL-TIME, WHICH IS 35 HOURS PER WEEK OR MORE, OR PART-TIME, WHICH IS LESS THAN 35 HOURS PER WEEK?

____0. No response
____1. Full-time
____2. Part-time (Specify)________________________

164. WHAT KIND OF WORK DO YOU DO? (If not specific, probe: PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE--FOR EXAMPLE, CAR WASHER, COOK, ELEVATOR MANAGER, CARPENTER, PUNCH PRESS OPERATOR, ACCOUNTANT, SHARECROPPER, MIGRANT WORKER, OFFICE MANAGER, TYPIST, SALES CLERK, TEACHER AIDE.)

____

165. WHAT KIND OF BUSINESS IS THAT JOB IN? (If not specific, probe: PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE--FOR EXAMPLE, HOME CONSTRUCTION, AUTOMOBILE FACTORY, GAS STATION, PRIVATE HOME, HOSPITAL, LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, COTTON FARM, FRUIT ORCHARD, TELEPHONE COMPANY, U.S. GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT STORE. THE NAME OF THE COMPANY IS NOT SUFFICIENT.)

____

166. (If obvious, DO NOT ask.) ARE YOU

____1. SELF-EMPLOYED

____2. SALARIED?

____0. NO response

167. WHERE IS IT? (Read response categories 1-4 before recording a response.)

____1. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?
____2. IN ANOTHER PART OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(e.g., Auburn, Opelika, Smith Station)?
____3. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(SUBURBAN OR COUNTRY)?
____4. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(ANOTHER TOWN OR COMMUNITY)?
____0. No response

168. WHO TAKES CARE OF (CHILD'S NAME) WHEN YOU ARE WORKING? (Check all that apply.)

____ 0. No response
____ 1. Adult member of household (Specify) ________________________
____ 2. Non-adult sibling(s)
____ 3. Other members of household (Specify) ________________________
____ 4. Other relative--not in household
____ 5. Unrelated person--not in household
____ 6. School
____ 7. Child care center
____ 8. Other (Specify) ____

169a. HAVE YOU HAD ANY OTHER JOBS OR PROMOTIONS ON YOUR PRESENT JOB IN THE LAST THREE YEARS?

____0. No response
____1. No

____2. Yes

169b. WHAT WERE THESE? (If more than 3, record on separate page.)

____9. Don't know; can't remember
____0. No response

1. Specific Job____________ Full-time________ Part-time______ No Resp.______
Business______________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

2. Specific Job____________ Full-time________ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business______________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

3. Specific Job____________ Full-time________ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business______________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.____
Dates: from____________ to____________

169c. IS YOUR PRESENT JOB BETTER, THE SAME, OR WORSE THAN THE ONE YOU HAD BEFORE?

____1. Better
____2. Worse
____3. The same
____0. No response

169d. WHY?________________________________
____
____
____

170a. (Ask of those who do not have jobs now) **HAVE YOU HAD ANY JOBS IN THE PAST THREE YEARS?**

____0. No response
____1. No

____2. Yes

170b. WHAT WERE THESE?

____9. Don't know; can't remember
____0. No response

1. Specific Job________________ Full-time_____ Part-time_____ No resp._______
Business____________________ Self-Employed_____ Salaried____ No resp._______
Dates: from________________ to________________

2. Specific Job________________ Full-time_______ Part-time______ No resp._______
Business____________________ Self-Employed______ Salaried_____ No resp._______
Dates: from________________ to________________

3. Specific Job________________ Full-time_______ Part-time______ No resp._______
Business Job________________ Self-Employed______ Salaried_____ No resp._______
Dates: from________________ to________________

If more than three jobs listed, record below:

171. ARE YOU MARRIED NOW? (This interview is intended for a female respondent. If by chance, the respondent is male, make appropriate substitutions throughout the rest of the interview--husband/wife, widowed/widower, he/she, etc.)

____0. No response

____1. Yes

ARE YOU (Check one.)

____a. MARRIED, BUT HUSBAND/WIFE TEMPORARILY ABSENT? (Skip to Question 172.)

____b. MARRIED AND LIVING WITH HUSBAND/WIFE? (Skip to Question 172.)

____c. SEPARATED? (Skip to Question 172.)

____2. No

ARE YOU (Check one.)

____a. SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED? (Skip to Question 183.)

____b. WIDOWED?

____c. DIVORCED?

____d. Separated?

172. WHAT WAS THE LAST GRADE IN SCHOOL THAT YOUR HUSBAND COMPLETED?____________

Don't know____________

173a. HAS HE GONE (OR DID HE GO) TO ANY OTHER SCHOOL?

____1. Yes

173b. WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL? ____________

____

____2. No

____9. Don't know

____0. No response

173c. HOW LONG DID HE GO THERE?____________

____

(Do not ask if widowed--skip to Question 182.)

173d. IS HE IN SCHOOL AT THE PRESENT TIME?

____0. No response

____1. Yes

____2. No

____9. Don't know

(Do not ask if widowed--skip to Question 182.)

174a. DOES YOUR HUSBAND (OR EX-HUSBAND) NOW HAVE A PAID JOB?

____0. No response

____1. Yes

174b. WHEN DID HE START WORKING THERE?____________________

175a. AT WHAT STEP ON THE LADDER WE LOOKED AT BEFORE (show ladder) WOULD YOU PUT YOUR HUSBAND'S JOB?

Number indicated ____________________

WHY? (Skip to Question 176.) ____________________

____

____2. No

____9. Don't know

175b. IF YOUR HUSBAND (OR EX-HUSBAND) WERE TO FIND A JOB, WHERE ON THE LADDER WOULD IT PROBABLY BE PLACED?

Number indicated____________________

WHY? ____________________

____

174c. IS HE PRESENTLY LOOKING FOR WORK?

____0. No response

____1. Yes

____2. No

____9. Don't know

(Skip to Question 182.)

176. IS YOUR HUSBAND (OR EX-HUSBAND) EMPLOYED FULL-TIME, WHICH IS 35 HOURS PER WEEK OR MORE, OR PART-TIME, WHICH IS LESS THAN 35 HOURS PER WEEK?

____0. No response

____1. Full-time

____2. Part-time (Specify)____________________

____9. Don't know

177. WHAT KIND OF WORK DOES HE DO? (If not specific, probe: PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE--FOR EXAMPLE, CAR WASHER, COOK, ELEVATOR MANAGER, CARPENTER, PUNCH PRESS OPERATOR, ACCOUNTANT, SHARECROPPER, MIGRANT WORKER, OFFICE MANAGER, TYPIST, SALES CLERK, TEACHER AIDE.)

____

178. WHAT KIND OF BUSINESS IS THAT JOB IN? (If not specific, probe: PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE--FOR EXAMPLE, HOME CONSTRUCTION, AUTOMOBILE FACTORY, GAS STATION, PRIVATE HOME, HOSPITAL, LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, COTTON FARM, FRUIT ORCHARDS, TELEPHONE COMPANY, U. S. GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT STORE. THE NAME OF THE COMPANY IS NOT SUFFICIENT.)

____

179. (If obvious do not ask.) IS HE (read responses 1-2)

____1. SELF-EMPLOYED?

____2. SALARIED?

____9. Don't know

____0. No response

180. WHERE IS HIS JOB LOCATED? (Read Responses 1-4)

____1. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?
____2. IN ANOTHER PART OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(e.g., Auburn, Opelika, Smith Station)?
____3. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(SUBURBAN OR COUNTRY)?
____4. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/COMMUNITY(ANOTHER TOWN OR COMMUNITY)?
____9. Don't know
____0. No response

181a. HAS YOUR HUSBAND HAD ANY OTHER JOBS OR PROMOTIONS ON HIS PRESENT JOB IN THE LAST THREE YEARS?

____0. No response
____1. No
____9. Don't know

____ 2. Yes 181b. WHAT WERE THESE? (If more than 3, record on separate page.)

____9 Don't know; can't remember
____0 No response

1. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

2. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

3. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

181c. IS HIS PRESENT JOB BETTER, THE SAME, OR WORSE THAN THE ONE HE HAD BEFORE?

____1. Better 181d. WHY?____________________
____2. Worse ____________________
____3. The same ____________________
____0. No response ____________________
____9. Don't know

182a. (If husband is not working now ask:) HAS HE HAD ANY JOBS IN THE PAST THREE YEARS?

____0. No response
____1. No
____9. Don't know

____2. Yes 182b. WHAT WERE THESE? (If more than 3, record on separate page.)
____9. Don't know
____0. No response

1. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

2. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

3. Specific Job____________ Full-time______ Part-time______ No resp.______
Business____________ Self-Employed______ Salaried______ No resp.______
Dates: from____________ to____________

183. (If obvious, do not ask.) DOES MOST OF YOUR MONEY COME FROM (Read responses 1-2)

____ 1. SALARY?
____ 2. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE?
____ 3. OTHER (Specify if noted, but DO NOT probe.)____________________
____ 0. No response

184. NOW ABOUT THE PEOPLE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD. FIRST, I'D LIKE YOU TO TELL ME BEGINNING WITH THE OLDEST AND GOING DOWN TO THE YOUNGEST, THE FIRST NAMES OF EVERYONE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD, INCLUDING YOURSELF, (CHILD'S NAME), AND PEOPLE WHO USUALLY LIVE HERE BUT MAY BE AWAY--IN SERVICE, SCHOOL, TRAVELING OR SOMETHING. (Record all answers below.) For each person listed, ask:

a. WHAT KIN IS ________________ TO (CHILD'S NAME)?

b. WHAT IS HIS/HER SEX? (Check M for male, F for female.)

c. WHAT IS HIS/HER AGE AS OF HIS/HER LAST BIRTHDAY?

d. (If 3 or older ask): IS __________________ IN SCHOOL NOW? (Includes Nursery School, Day Care, and Head Start. Record grade level when appropriate.)

e. (If over 14, ask): DOES ________________ HAVE A FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME PAID JOB?

f. (If "No" to "d" and "e", ask): WHAT IS ________________ DOING NOW?

g. (For all children 12 years and younger, ask): HAS ____________________ EVER ATTENDED ANY PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM? (If "Yes" ask): WHICH ONE?

h. IS HE/SHE LIVING AT HOME NOW? (If "No" ask): WHERE IS HE/SHE?

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.
NAME	KIN	SEX	AGE	SCHOOL	WORK	OTHER	PRE-SCHOOL (Specify.)	AWAY (Specify.)
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			
		M F			YES NO			

185. (If there is a child(ren) older than 3, and in preschool/Head Start, ask:) WHY DO YOU WANT (YOUNGER CHILD'S NAME) TO GO TO HEAD START/PRESCHOOL?

____

____

____

IN YOUR FAMILY, WHO WOULD HAVE THE MOST TO SAY ABOUT THE FOLLOWING THINGS:

	Father	Mother	Other (Specify)
186. WHAT KIND OF A CAR TO BUY			
187. GETTING ANOTHER T.V. SET			
188. LETTING (CHILD'S NAME) SPEND THE NIGHT WITH HIS BEST FRIEND			
189. MOVING TO A NEW HOUSE OR APARTMENT			
190. WHERE TO GO ON A TRIP			
191. HOW LATE (CHILD'S NAME) CAN PLAY OUTSIDE			

192. ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU MOVED IN THE LAST 3 YEARS?________________

193. ABOUT HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS HOUSE/APARTMENT?

____0. No response

____1. # years (Specify)________________

____2. All my life --- (Skip to Question 198.)

194. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

____0. No response

____1. # years (Specify)________________

____2. All my life --- (Skip to Question 197a.)

195. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THIS TOWN?

____0. No response

____1. # years (Specify)________________

____2. All my life --- (Skip to Question 197a.)

196. BEFORE YOU MOVED TO THIS TOWN, WHERE DID YOU LIVE?

____________	____________	____________
City	State	Country

197a. ARE YOU NOW LIVING IN A DIFFERENT HOUSE OR APARTMENT THAN YOU WERE THIS TIME A YEAR AGO?

____1. Yes

197b. IS THIS A BETTER, OR WORSE PLACE TO LIVE THAN YOUR PLACE A YEAR AGO, OR ABOUT THE SAME?

____0. No response
____1. Better
____2. Worse
____3. About the same
____9. Don't know

____2. No

____0. No response

198. DO YOU WANT TO MOVE?

____0. No response
____1. Yes
____2. No
____9. Don't know

199a. DO YOU EXPECT TO MOVE?

____1. Yes

199b. WHEN?________________________________

199c. WHERE?_______________________________

____2. No

____9. Don't know

____0. No response

200. WHEN YOU THINK OF "HOME," WHAT PLACE DO YOU THINK OF?

____

201a. DO YOU RENT OR OWN THE PLACE WHERE YOU NOW LIVE?

____1. Rent

201b. DO YOU RENT FROM PUBLIC HOUSING OR A PRIVATE LANDLORD? (If obvious, do not ask.)

____0. No response
____1. Public housing
____2. Private landlord (or corporation)

____2. Own

____0. No response

202. HOW MANY ROOMS ARE THERE IN THE HOUSE WHERE YOU NOW LIVE? (NOT COUNTING THE BATHROOM, UTILITY ROOMS, OR OTHER ROOMS UNSUTIABLE FOR SLEEPING OR GENERAL LIVING PURPOSES.)

____0. No response

____ Number

203. (Ask only if interview conducted elsewhere than home) IS YOUR HOUSE A (Read responses 1-7).

____1. HOUSE FOR JUST ONE FAMILY, DETACHED FROM THE OTHER HOUSES AROUND IT?
____2. DUPLEX OR ROW HOUSE, WITH ONE UNIT FOR EACH FAMILY?
____3. A SINGLE HOUSE CONVERTED TO APARTMENTS?
____4. A GARDEN APARTMENT?
____5. A HIGH-RISE APARTMENT?
____6. A TRAILER?
____7. APARTMENT IN PARTLY BUSINESS BUILDING?
____8. SOMETHING ELSE?(PLEASE TELL WHAT)____________________
____0. No response

204a. DO YOU HAVE A YARD?

____1. Yes
204b. CAN YOU USE THE YARD FOR THE CHILDREN TO PLAY IN?
____1. Yes
____2. No. 204c. WHY NOT?____________________
____
____
____0. No response

____2. No

DOES (CHILD'S NAME) HAVE HIS/HER OWN:

		Yes	No
205.	ROOM?..	[ ]	[ ]
206.	BED?..	[ ]	[ ]
207.	DRESSER, CLOTHES CHEST OR SECTION/DRAWER(S) FOR HIS/HER CLOTHES ONLY?..	[ ]	[ ]
208.	CLOSET (OR SECTION OF CLOSET SET ASIDE FOR HIM/HER)?...............	[ ]	[ ]
209.	TOYS?..	[ ]	[ ]
210.	TOY BOX (OR OTHER PLACE TO KEEP OWN THINGS)?.......................	[ ]	[ ]
211.	PET?..	[ ]	[ ]

(INTERVIEWER: If child shares pet but is responsible for care, check "Yes.")

212. DOES ANYONE USUALLY SLEEP IN THE ROOM WITH (CHILD'S NAME)?

____1. Yes

212a. WHO USUALLY SLEEPS IN THE ROOM WITH (CHILD'S NAME)? (Check all that apply.)

____0. No response
____1. Like-sexed child(ren)
____2. Child(ren) of the opposite sex
____3. Parents or caretakers

____2. No

____0. No response

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DO YOU HAVE? (For each item respondent has, ask: HOW MANY?)

		No	Yes	Number
213.	AUTOMOBILE	☐	☐	________
214.	TELEVISION	☐	☐	________
215.	RADIO	☐	☐	________
216.	HI-FI, STEREO, RECORD PLAYER	☐	☐	________
217.	TELEPHONE	☐	☐	________
218.	ENCYCLOPEDIA	☐	☐	________
219.	DICTIONARY	☐	☐	________
220.	VACUUM CLEANER	☐	☐	________

221. WHERE WERE YOU BORN?____
(Town) (State) (Country, if not USA)

____0. No response
____9. Don't know

222. WHEN WERE YOU BORN?____
Month / Day / Year

____0. No response
____9. Don't know

223. WAS YOUR CHILDHOOD OR ADOLESCENCE/TEENS SPENT, FOR THE MOST PART, IN URBAN OR RURAL BACKGROUNDS?

____1. Urban
____2. Rural
____0. No response

COULD YOU TELL ME WHERE YOUR PARENTS WERE BORN?

224. Mother____
(Town) (State) (Country, if not USA)

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

225. Father____
(Town) (State) (Country, if not USA)

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

(If respondent is married, separated, divorced, or widowed, ask Questions 226-230, otherwise skip to Question 231.)

226. WHERE WAS YOUR HUSBAND BORN?________________________
(Town) (State) (Country, in not USA)

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

227. WHEN WAS YOUR HUSBAND BORN?________________________
Month / Day / Year

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

228. WAS HIS CHILDHOOD OR ADOLESCENCE/TEENS SPENT, FOR THE MOST PART, IN URBAN OR RURAL BACKGROUNDS?

____1. Urban

____2. Rural

____0. No response

COULD YOU TELL ME WHERE YOUR HUSBAND'S PARENTS WERE BORN?

229. Mother____
(Town) (State) (Country, if not USA)

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

230. Father____
(Town) (State) (Country, if not USA)

____0. No response ____9. Don't know

231. HOW MANY HOURS A DAY DOES (CHILD'S NAME) WATCH TELEVISION ON WEEK DAYS AND DURING THE WEEKEND? (Circle one for each, a for weekdays and b for weekend.)

a.	0	1/2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
b.	0	1/2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

232. DOES HE/SHE EVER WATCH CHANNEL (10 in Portland, 7 in Lee County, 52 in Trenton)?

____1. Yes

232a. HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every day
____2. 3-4 days a week
____3. 1-2 days a week
____4. Twice a month
____5. Once a month
____6. Less often
____9. Don't know

232b. WHAT PROGRAMS DOES HE/SHE WATCH?

____
____
____

____2. No

____9. Don't know

____0. No response

233. DO YOU READ ANY NEWSPAPERS?

____1. Yes

WHICH ONES? (Full names if known)

1.________________________ HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every day
____2. Several days a week
____3. Sunday only
____4. Less often

2.________________________ HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every day
____2. Several days a week
____3. Sunday only
____4. Less often

____2. No

____0. No response

234a. DO YOU READ ANY MAGAZINES?

____1. Yes

234b. WHICH ONES? (Full names if known.)

1.____________________ HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every week
____2. Every 2 weeks
____3. Once a month
____4. Less often

2.____________________ HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every week
____2. Every 2 weeks
____3. Once a month
____4. Less often

3.____________________ HOW OFTEN?

____0. No response
____1. Every week
____2. Every 2 weeks
____3. Once a month
____4. Less often

____2. No

____0. No response

ONE THING IN WHICH WE ARE VERY MUCH INTERESTED IS WHETHER OR NOT YOU GO OUT OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FOR FOOD, OR ENTERTAINMENT, OR TO SEE RELATIVES AND FRIENDS.

235a. DO YOU HAVE ANY RELATIVES (KINFOLK) WHO LIVE WITHIN 20 MILES OF HERE?

____0. No response
____1. No
____9. Don't know

(Skip to Question 248a.)

____2. Yes

235b. HOW MANY?____________________

If more than 3 in Question 235b, ask: WHO ARE THE 3 YOU VISIT THE MOST? IF YOU DON'T WANT TO GIVE ME THEIR NAMES, WE CAN CALL THEM A, B, AND C.

If 3 or less in Question 235b, ask: WHO ARE THEY? IF YOU DON'T WANT TO GIVE ME THEIR NAMES, WE CAN CALL THEM A, B, AND C.

Record names below. Ask questions for first relative, then second relative, then third relative.

NOW, FOR (FIRST RELATIVE) THAT YOU VISIT:	1st Relative	2nd Relative	3rd Relative
Record name or relationship here →			
236-238. DO YOU USUALLY TAKE (CHILD'S NAME)?	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No
239-241. HOW FAR FROM YOUR HOME DOES THAT RELATIVE LIVE? (Answer in blocks or miles.)			
# blocks or			
# miles			
(99=Don't know)			
242-244. WHERE IS IT? (Read list.)			
0. No response....................			
1. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?..........			
2. IN ANOTHER PART OF THIS CITY/AREA..........................			
3. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (IN SUBURBS OR COUNTRY)?...........			
4. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (ANOTHER TOWN)?................			
245-247. HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO?			
0. No response....................			
1. More than once a week..........			
2. Once a week....................			
3. Once every two weeks...........			
4. Once a month...................			
5. Less than once a month.........			

248a. DO YOU HAVE FRIENDS IN THIS GENERAL AREA THAT YOU VISIT MORE THAN ONCE A YEAR?

____0. No response
____1. No } (Skip to Question 261a.)
____9. Don't know

____2. Yes 248b. HOW MANY? ______________________

If more than 3 in Question 248b, ask: WHO ARE THE 3 YOU VISIT MOST? IF YOU DON'T WANT TO GIVE ME THEIR NAMES, WE CAN CALL THEM A, B, AND C.

If 3 or less in Question 248b, ask: WHO ARE THEY? IF YOU DON'T WANT TO GIVE ME THEIR NAMES, WE CAN CALL THEM A, B, AND C.

Record names below. Ask questions for first friend, then second friend, then third friend.

NOW, FOR (FIRST FRIEND) THAT YOU VISIT:	1st Friend	2nd Friend	3rd Friend
Record names here			
249-251. DO YOU USUALLY TAKE (CHILD'S NAME)?	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No	__0.No resp. __1.Yes __2.No
252-254. HOW FAR FROM YOUR HOME DOES THAT FRIEND LIVE? (Answer in blocks or miles.)			
# blocks or			
# miles			
(99=Don't know)			
255-257. WHERE IS IT? (Read list.)			
0. No response..................			
1. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?.........			
2. IN ANOTHER PART OF THIS CITY/AREA........................			
3. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (IN SUBURBS OR COUNTRY)?..........			
4. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (ANOTHER TOWN)?...............			
258-260. HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO?			
0. No response..................			
1. More than once a week.........			
2. Once a week...................			
3. Once every two weeks..........			
4. Once a month..................			
5. Less than once a month........			

261a. ARE THERE ANY PLACES WHERE YOU USUALLY GO OUT FOR ENTERTAINMENT OR RELAXATION?

____1. No response
____2. No
____9. Don't know
(Skip to question 274.)

____2. Yes 261b. HOW MANY?____________________

If more than 3 in Question 261b, ask: WHAT ARE THE 3 YOU VISIT MOST?

If 3 or less in Question 261b, ask: WHAT ARE THEY?

If respondent hesitates, say: IF YOU DON"T WANT TO GIVE ME THE NAMES OF THESE PLACES, WE CAN CALL THEM A, B, AND C.

Record names below. Ask questions for first place, then second place, then third place.

NOW, FOR THE (FIRST PLACE) THAT YOU VISIT:	1st Place	2n Place	3rd Place
Record Name of Place here.			
262-264. DO YOU USUALLY TAKE (CHILD'S NAME)?	__0. No resp. __1. Yes __2. No	__0. No resp. __1. Yes __2. No	__0. No resp. __1. Yes __2. No
265-267. HOW FAR FROM YOUR HOME IS THIS PLACE?			
# blocks or			
# miles			
(99=Don't know)			
268-270. WHERE IS IT? (Read list.)			
0. No response..................			
1. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?.........			
2. IN ANOTHER PART OF THIS CITY/AREA?........................			
3. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (IN SUBURBS OR COUNTRY)?..........			
4. OUTSIDE OF THIS CITY/AREA (ANOTHER TOWN)?...............			
271-273. HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO?			
0. No response..................			
1. More than once a week.........			
2. Once a week..................			
3. Once every two weeks..........			
4. Once a month..................			
5. Less than once a month........			

274. DO YOU USUALLY SHOP WITHIN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD, OR OUTSIDE OF IT?

____0. No response
____1. In neighborhood
____2. Outside neighborhood

275a. HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO DOWNTOWN OR INTO THE CITY?

(Trenton - around State and Broad Streets.)
(Portland - around S. W. Broadway and S. W. 3rd Street)
(Lee County - shopping center between Auburn and Opelika--Penny's, etc.)

____1. Every day
____2. Every week
____3. Every two weeks
____4. Every month
____5. Every six months
____6. Seldom or never
____0. No response

275b. DO YOU USUALLY TAKE (CHILD'S NAME) WITH YOU?

____0. No response
____1. Yes
____2. No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION; YOU HAVE BEEN MOST HELPFUL.

(Interviewer: Check to make sure that you have asked all questions before leaving respondent.)

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS

276. Did you see respondent discipline a child?

____1. Yes (Specify) ____________________

____2. No

277. Did respondent ask you for any help or information?

____1. Yes (Specify) ____________________

____2. No

278-282. Rate the person interviewed as to cooperativeness:

	Section				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Very cooperative. Appeared friendly and relaxed with interviewer. No defensiveness. Volunteered information readily. Showed interest in the study and became involved in the interview.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cooperative. Appeared friendly and relaxed with the interviewer. Answered questions readily, but did not volunteer information beyond that requested. May or may not have shown interest in the study	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Slightly uncooperative. Generally answered questions readily, but may have shown some defensiveness; maintained distance from interviewer.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Uncooperative. Tenseness and defensiveness in answering questions. Expressed reservations about amount of time spent. An undercurrent of resistance to the interview. Little interest in the study.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Very uncooperative. Explicit resistance to the interviewer or the interview. No interest in the study.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
283-287. Much of the information obtained may be unreliable because person interviewed seemed so concerned with making a "good impression" that questions may not have been answered truthfully. (Check if applicable.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

288. Rate the person interviewed as to your difficulty in understanding her speech.

____1. Very difficult
____2. Somewhat difficult
____3. Not at all difficult

289. Rate the person interviewed as to her difficulty in understanding your speech.

____1. Very difficult
____2. Somewhat difficult
____3. Not at all difficult

290. Rate the person interviewed as to her difficulty in understanding the interview questions.

____1. Very difficult
____2. Somewhat difficult
____3. Not at all difficult

291-294. Was anyone present besides respondent during interview?

___1. One or more people present (Fill in below.)
___2. No one present

Person(s) Present	Number	Relationship to Child	Length of Time Present
STUDY CHILD(REN)		XXXXXXXXXXXXX	
OTHER CHILDREN			
OTHER ADULTS			
HUSBAND	XXXXXX		

295a. Did anything unusual occur during the interview?

____1. Yes

295b. WHAT? ________________________________

____2. No

For Home Interviewers Only:

296. Type of dwelling - the dwelling is a:

____a. Single house, one family (detached or semi-detached)
____b. Duplex or row house, one unit for each family
____c. Converted single house, converted rowhouse, multi-family
____d. Apartment privately owned; garden-type
____e. Apartment (public housing; garden-type - housing project)
____f. Apartment (privately owned; multi-story)
____g. Apartment (public housing; multi-story - housing project)
____h. Trailer
____i. Other (Specify)____

297. Are surrounding houses:

____a. like respondent's house
____b. different from respondent's house How?________________________

298. Is the outside of respondent's house:

____a. new, in good repair
____b. new, in poor repair
____c. old, in good repair
____d. old, in poor repair

299. Does respondent's house have a yard?

____a. Yes
____b. No

300. Does there seem to be adequate outside play space available?

____a. Yes
____b. No

301. Noise Level

____a. a lot of noise

____b. some noise

____c. little or no noise

302. Was the noise level distracting?

____a. Yes

____b. No

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

Supplementary Table

Table B-1

Means and Standard Deviations of Year 6 Reading, Math, and Raven Scores of Study Children According to Race, Head Start Attendance, and Sex (within Race)

	Reading		Math		Raven	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Total	30.18	9.76	33.83	10.23	20.42	5.28
White	36.20	8.59	40.76	9.57	23.27	5.05
Black	26.57	8.58	29.74	8.21	18.91	4.74
White Males	35.08	9.07	41.76	9.38	23.27	5.03
White Females	37.17	8.06	39.91	9.67	23.28	5.08
Black Males	24.71	7.94	29.03	7.92	18.93	4.61
Black Females	28.69	8.80	30.60	8.48	18.89	4.90
Head Start, Black	25.82	8.65	29.15	8.23	18.49	4.74
No Preschool, Black	28.95	7.78	31.55	7.26	19.63	4.46